

Kahill Perkins  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
kahilltperkins@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and members of the committee thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Kahill Perkins and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to urge the committee to vote no on SB 63 / 2071.

I am a Kansan who loves her trans friends and family and knows that a life lived with access to gender affirming care is the only way to keep people who need it alive. Seeing the unrest and the fear in the eyes of the people I love and seeing how every time a bill like this is introduced even in other states it takes a direct toll on the safety of those I love, I cannot fathom a reason why this bill should be passed or who it is intended to protect or benefit.

Thank you again for hearing my story and my thoughts on this bill, I encourage you to vote no. Thank you.

Kami Day  
Private Citizen  
kamiday@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Kami Day and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

I know you all want to protect minors who identify as transgender, but SB 63/ HB 2071 will only hurt those young people. They are in the care of their parents and health providers who know them, who are best qualified to make decisions on their behalf. And those youth have voices of their own to express their gender identity and to ask that the adults in their lives pay attention to them. We must believe them. Gender identity should not be a public discussion--it's a private and personal matter--and decisions about the lives of transgender youth should not be made by politicians, who have expertise in governing but not medical expertise. I have a number of friends (young and not so young) who are trans, and they are terrified about losing the care they need, terrified that open discrimination against them will now be sanctioned. I have seen how, once they begin to live their lives as the gender they truly know they are, a huge burden is lifted from them. They are not as afraid or lonely--they are able to feel joy. I identify with the gender I was assigned at birth, so I cannot understand what it is like to be trans, but I don't have to understand. I only have to accept and support, and I hope you will do that. Trans youth are a very small percentage of young people, and that minority needs your help in protecting their the fundamental right to live freely, make their own choices, and strive for the fulfilling life the authors of our Declaration of Independence hoped for.

Thank you for giving me a few minutes of your time, and I encourage you all to vote NO on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Karen S Mitchell  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
mbbronxoz@aol.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairperson and Members of the Committee: Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Karen Mitchell, and I am a voter in Shawnee, KS. I am writing today to encourage the Committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I oppose these bills as they interfere with family issues and government should not intervene with such issues. We should support parents who seek gender-affirming care of their minor children as they know their children best and such decisions should be made by the parents.

I appreciate your time and for giving me the chance to express my opinion. Again, I encourage you to vote no on the passage of SB 63/ HB 2071.

## HB2071 Written Only Proponent Testimony

Chairman Carpenter and members of the committee,

I am writing in strong support of SB63, also known as the Help Not Harm Act. I believe this bill is an important step in protecting the most vulnerable members of our society—our children.

I stand firmly against gender transition procedures for minors. These treatments and surgeries are life-altering, often irreversible, and carry significant physical, emotional, and psychological risks. The numerous laws restricting the actions of minors make it clear that they are not equipped to comprehend the long-term consequences of such decisions—especially those influenced by external pressures from social media, peers, and even adults who should know better. Yet, we continue to allow it to happen.

This issue goes beyond individual choices; it's about safeguarding vulnerable children from practices that could harm them for life. While some may argue that these procedures provide relief or affirmation, studies and firsthand accounts reveal that many young people who undergo them experience regret and lasting complications.

Moreover, I strongly oppose the use of taxpayer dollars to support or promote such procedures. State-funded resources should prioritize protecting children, not enabling irreversible treatments on individuals who are not yet capable of making fully informed decisions. It's our responsibility to act as a shield for those who cannot yet advocate for themselves.

I pray the committee will vote to pass this bill out of committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Kari Sue

Vosburgh

Sedgwick County Precinct Committeewoman

Kassius Andersen  
Private Citizen  
kassiusandersen@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Committee Members, I first and foremost thank you for all that you do for our State. Your work is vital to protecting the rights and freedoms of Kansans. It is through this legislative process that we are able to see the true essence of democracy that we laud so highly.

I am a private citizen writing to voice my objection to the proposed legislation. I am a practitioner of law, and importantly, I am a transgender individual.

Per a June 2024 article published by 12 news in Wichita, a majority of Kansas counties do not have enough doctors to provide care. Citizens in two thirds of the counties in Kansas report that they do not have a primary care doctor. A report by the American Immigration Council reported that in 2015, Kansas faced severe physician shortages, with some counties reporting zero physicians per 100,000 residents.

Placing these restrictions on healthcare providers will further stress an already overwhelmed system. Doctors, when caring for their patients, based on their countless years of practice and extensive training, should not have to worry about the overreaching hand of the legislative branch. We look to the law to set clear restrictions on our daily lives and actions, but we do so with an understanding that we consult with the expertise and training when matters go beyond a basic understanding.

In the United States, the widely accepted treatment protocols for gender affirming care are published by the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH). These guidelines are developed through a systematic review of all available scientific evidence. All major medical and mental health professional associations in the United States recognize these guidelines. Those guidelines are a long and lengthy process where a patient and doctor go through whole explorations of a variety of treatments. This is not a simple process. You do not walk into the door and make a demand, this is a long and arduous process that explores a variety of avenues for transitioning outside of the medical context.

Implementation of this bill would result in a potential chilling effect on the medical system as a whole. In a state already struggling to provide an adequate level of care, there is a foreseeable harm in imposing further restrictions, and, should a provider be found violative of this proposed legislation, lose their funding, critical medical care will be torn away by Kansans across the state.

Further, implementation of this bill would violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. This bill facially differentiates children based on their gender, as the bill specifically targets transgender individuals over their non transgender colleagues. If a child whose gender identity is aligned with the sex assigned at birth is prescribed a hormone regiment, this would be allowed under the bill. However, that same child, should their gender identity is not aligned with their sex assigned at birth, this would be a clear discriminatory action against an individual's gender. If an assigned female at birth child is denied a medication that an assigned male at birth child can access, that is clear discrimination by the state that would be violative of the fourteenth amendment.

Where the State intentionally penalizes a person identified as male at birth for actions that it tolerates in someone identified as female at birth, that is prohibited conduct that does not stand under the fourteenth amendment of this country.

That is the background with the law, very, very facially summarized. But the fact of the matter is simply this: this bill goes against all that Kansas stands for. The State of Kansas has a long and storied history that was founded on one belief, that people should be free to live their best life free from intervention. We have always been a state where we value freedom of choice. A freedom to live how we wish to be, and without an overhanging shadow.

Finally, it bears remembering, in moments in history, there have been times where a choice comes before the state to infringe upon the lives of a minority groups. When we look back at our most shameful moments, it is usually at times like this. Times where legislation based on erroneous belief and fear mongering creates legislation that is reactionary. These reactionary laws are ones that do not offer protection, but rather harm an already vulnerable population. We stand at a time where Kansas can stand for what it always has, a freedom to exist and be. And for this reason, I oppose this legislation.

Kat Dutton  
Private Citizen  
katdut123456789@gmail.com  
1/26/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Kat Dutton and I am a trans teen that would be affected by these bills. I am writing today to encourage you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I am a transgender male which basically means I was born a girl but identify as a boy. I have known this pretty much since I was ten. I have been lucky enough to have accepting parents and teachers who love me for who I am. I also have had the unfortunate ability to deal with bullies and bigots. I once had a man scream in my face that I was going to hell at a pride parade. I have had to deal with transphobic comments like "Go kill yourself tranny" and "You are gonna be damned to hell for your sins, you faggot tranny". Luckily the school I go to has a gender neutral bathroom so once I dealt with transphobia in the women's bathroom (the bathroom to the gender I was born) I was able to use the gender neutral bathroom. I feel more comfortable there. Also pretty much the whole school accepts my identity and calls me "He" and my chosen name. I just want what every teenage boy wants; a nice relationship and friends. I don't like the fact that I have to speak to a committee of grown men who probably don't actually give a crap about me but instead want to control people's lives. Please stick to regulating parking zones and not people's body and livelihoods. I am living a good life in a nice town, with a nice school, and a nice church where they love me. I even have a guy who likes me and who I like back. All I want is to live my life. Trans kids die already at an alarming rate. These bills are encouraging transphobia. My mother is scared for my life. I will not be another martyr to be cried over for a night and then move on with bills like this. All I can think of is Nex Benedict who not a year ago was brutally murdered in a school bathroom.

Once again I thank you for your time. Please I beg of you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Kate Healy  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
kateliningracehealy@gmail.com  
1/28/1988

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Kate Healy and I am a voter in Sedgwick County. I am writing to encourage the committee to vote No on SB 63 / HB 2071.

One of my best friends is transgender, and she's taught me so much about kindness and patience. She was actually she was invited to KU by a playwright back in 2019 and still has much love for Kansas. Elle expressed to me how much she wished she could have even talked with a doctor when she was younger to understand complex thoughts and potential options.. She remind me how much it hurts to refuse oxygen to who you really are. Silencing yourself can create debilitating patterns, and she was told to sublimate repeatedly.

It's unhealthy to live in a lie for too long, gender affirming care is life saving care. This legislation would not only restrict medically safe and proven to be beneficial procedures for young trans people, but it would threaten physicians and twist fear into their daily lives. I believe that legislation like this actually takes power away from the credibility of government. It has the effect of making lawmakers seem mostly eager to ban and restrict, instead of playing a supportive role in our lives.

Thank you for hearing my thoughts, I encourage you to vote No of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071.



Katherine Dillon  
private citizen  
katherinedillon09@yahoo.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you. My name is Katherine Dillon and I am a voter in Shawnee County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 20

A supportive student-teacher relationship has been identified by research as a protective factor for TGNC-identified youth.\* As a teacher and school counselor, I can anecdotally attest to the protective nature of supportive relationships with students. Unfortunately, this bill limits my ability to provide support to TGNC-identified youth and infringes on my freedom of speech. Research shows that TGNC-identified youth are over three times more likely to experience suicidal ideation compared to their cisgender peers. TGNC-identified youth are also more likely to engage in risky behaviors such as binge drinking and self-harm.\* If it is the intention of legislators to protect the wellbeing of all Kansans, I politely ask you vote NO on this bill and to consider how you can encourage, not limit, teachers' ability to support students.

\* <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1054139X17302070>

Once again, I thank you for hearing my thoughts on this bill and I encourage you to vote no on the passage of SB 63/HB 2071

Kathy Kappes-Sum  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
kkappessum@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Kathy Kappes-Sum and I am a voter in Shawnee. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

Gender-affirming care saves lives. It really is that simple, and so many of you count yourselves as firmly pro-life. If you really value life, part of that is helping the children of Kansas grow to be happy, healthy adults.

It's so hard for children to feel like they're in the wrong body, and 41% of LGBTQ young people have seriously considered suicide in the past year. They're 4 times more likely to attempt suicide than their peers, and that is a problem for all of us.

My child was considering suicide and called for help before she did. After years of counseling, she found gender-affirming care that allowed her to become a young adult and productive member of society. She's in a good situation now, but denying gender-affirming care would have put her in a very different place.

Please allow children, their families, and their doctors to make the decisions about what's right for them. Gender-affirming care is healthcare and should be available to anyone who needs it, regardless of where they live.

Once again, thank you for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you to vote no on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. I appreciate your time and consideration.

HB2071  
Katie Gannaway  
Private Citizen  
1/26/25  
kegannaway@gmail.com  
OPPONENT

Members of the committee, thank you for taking the time to consider my testimony. My name is Katie Gannaway and I am an employee of the state of Kansas. I am writing today in strong opposition to HB2071.

Gender affirming care is lifesaving care for trans and gender nonconforming individuals. Preventing medical professionals from providing trans youth and their families with the best evidence-based treatment plans is dangerous. It has been proven time and again that access to gender affirming care saves lives, and this bill infringes upon its citizens' ability to access medical knowledge necessary to make safe and informed decisions. Trans youth and their families have the right to self-determination and medical professionals have a responsibility to offer their patients the most current evidence-based treatment option. The state does not have the right nor the medical expertise to pass a bill directly inhibiting these things.

Additionally, preventing state employees from acknowledging and accepting changes in gender expression as a part of social transition is harmful to Kansas youth and actively attempts to suppress the freedom of expression granted by the first amendment. Experimenting with gender expression through the alteration of your appearance is a normal part of a child's development. Among cisgendered youth, a wide variation of gender expression can be seen every day and changes to that expression in the form of changes to hair, makeup, clothing, etc. are largely unexamined and often met with positive reactions. Attempting to prevent trans youth from altering their outward expressions using these same methods is singling them out for unequal and unjust treatment.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my perspective. I strongly encourage you to vote no on the passage of HB2071.

January 27th, 2025

RE: House Bill No. 2071

Dear Honorable Committee Members,

Thank you for taking the time today to read my letter. My name is Katie Korte and I am a concerned community member residing in Lenexa, Kansas. I am writing to you today regarding the introduction of HB 2071.

As someone who values equitable healthcare access, inclusivity, the protection of human rights, and - most importantly - as a relative of a transgender young adult, this bill concerns me deeply. I feel compelled to voice my opposition.

My transgender relative always felt different, even as a child. When she came out to her family as trans, she was met with support and love by some relatives, but sadly, members of her immediate family were not supportive. In fact, they made her continue presenting as male, and worse; they became abusive toward her. Over the years that followed, she struggled with self-harm due to being forced to live as a boy.

Transgender children, like all children, deserve to live their lives in safety - free from discrimination, prejudice, and abuse. They deserve to live as their authentic selves, as the gender they truly are. As my relative explained, "I am not 'trying to be' a girl, I don't 'feel like' a girl, I don't 'want to be' a girl - I *AM* a girl."

This bill is extreme and overreaching - it restricts safe and fully reversible interventions like hormone blockers and social transition that are pivotal to the wellbeing of trans children. Research and data consistently show that transgender children and teens face higher rates of mental health issues and suicide. Instead of exacerbating these challenges, we should be working towards a society that accepts and supports children and teens who are transgender. They should have the freedom to make personal and medical decisions with their parents, doctors, and therapists, just like all other Kansans.

I urge you to consider the impact this bill would have on the lives of transgender individuals and to take a stand against it. By doing so, you would be affirming the values of equality and justice that are foundational of our nation.

Thank you for considering my family's perspective and experience, and we ask that you vote AGAINST HB 2071.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Katie Korte". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Katie Korte

Katie Williams  
Defense of Democracy KS- State Director  
katie@defenseofdemocracy.org  
1/25/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today. My name is Katie Williams and I am a resident and voter in Gardner Kansas. I am here to discuss HB 2071, a bill that is of great significance to our community. I respectfully urge the committee to vote no on this bill.

This bill proposes to ban all gender-affirming healthcare for transgender minors, including essential medical care such as puberty blockers and hormone replacement therapy. It also seeks to prevent the use of state funds for these medically necessary treatments and bars state employees who interact with children from advocating for or providing gender-affirming care.

I oppose HB 2071 because it fundamentally undermines the doctor-patient relationship, which should be guided by medical science and not political agendas. The freedom to make private medical decisions should remain with patients, their families, and qualified medical professionals. Gender-affirming care is not only evidence-based but also crucial for the well-being and survival of transgender youth. This care is supported by every major medical association and is recognized as vital to the mental and physical health of transgender individuals.

Moreover, the bill's vague language around what constitutes "promoting" or "advocating" for gender-affirming care is alarmingly broad. Such ambiguity has far-reaching implications, potentially impacting educators, counselors, and any state-funded workers interacting with trans youth. This not only poses a risk to their careers but also stifles free speech and discriminates against an already vulnerable population.

Last year, this bill was rejected due to its overreaching implications, which extend beyond healthcare and into the daily lives of public employees. It threatens to bring harm to those it claims to protect and disrupts the lives of countless families by denying essential care.

As someone who has witnessed the benefits of such care through close connections with transgender individuals and their families, I can attest to its necessity. These are not abstract issues; they are about real people in our communities—our neighbors, friends, and family members who deserve to make decisions about their healthcare with those who understand their medical needs

I urge the committee to consider these points seriously and reject HB 2071. We must protect our youth by ensuring they have access to the compassionate, essential healthcare they deserve.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Kavitha Dileepan  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
kavitha.dileepan@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for allowing me to share my thoughts on SB 63/ HB 2071. My name is Kavitha Dileepan. I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63/ HB 2071 .

I am a pediatric endocrinologist, and blocking SB 63/ HB 2071 is an essential issue for many children in the state of Kansas. SB 63/ HB 2071 is very broad and overreaching. It fails to recognize that gender-affirming care is life-saving, in that access to care that reduces depression, anxiety, and risk of suicide in transgender youth. Denying transgender youth access to gender-affirming care infringes on the rights of parents and children to make informed decisions for themselves, and it undermines the knowledge and expertise of highly trained physicians. Further, threatening licensure of practicing physicians is a significant example of bureaucratic overreach since gender-affirming care in pediatrics follows evidence-based guidelines developed by consensus among international experts from the organizations of the Endocrine Society and WPATH.

Thank you again for your consideration of my thoughts on this bill. I highly encourage you all to vote no on the passage of SB 63/HB 2071.

Keaton Vaughn  
Private Citizen  
keatonmvaughn@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me the time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Keaton Vaughn and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I am transgender and gender-affirming care is lifesaving care. I know this from my own personal experience. I would not be who I am today without it, in fact I might not be here at all. This bill is overly broad and would ban all gender affirming healthcare for trans minors. If this bill goes into law, it will take away necessary medical care that is a private decision between families and their doctors. Gender affirming care is evidence based and backed by the medical community. It is widely proven that this type of care helps patients not only be who they are but live longer lives as their true selves. Taking away this care will lead to increased youth suicide rates and the exit of tax paying families from the state of Kansas.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.



Dear Committee Members,

I am writing in OPPOSITION to HB 2071.

This testimony is WRITTEN ONLY.

This Bill represents another intrusion by big Government into the private life of Kansas citizens. These decisions should be made ONLY by the patient, their physician, and (in the case of minors) their guardian. Please stop trying to marginalize your constituents. Please stop expanding the scope of Government. And PLEASE vote No on this Bill.

Thank you,

Kelli Johnsen

602 W. 12<sup>th</sup> Ave

Emporia, KS 66801

Kelly Dean Brende  
Private Citizen  
kbrende23@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

I appreciate your review of my written testimony regarding SB 63 / HB 2071. I urge you to vote NO on this bill. My name is Kelly Brende, and I am a voter in Johnson County.

Medical decisions should NOT be made by the government. Parents and families, with guidance from their doctors, should be the only ones involved in making decisions regarding their children's medical care. Medical care is highly individualized based on many factors that parents and doctors consider in making their decisions using evidence based model of assessment and informed consent.

This bill is unconstitutional and will subject our State to much litigation and its associated costs. The bill includes terms which are overly broad and could be interpreted as applying to school personnel as well. The bill goes even further and infers with state employees' free speech rights.

Again, I urge you to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071 as it interferes with parents rights to make healthcare decisions for their families as well as being unconstitutional by violating free speech and being overly broad.

Kelly Vuong  
Private Citizen  
k\_vuong79@yahoo.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

My name is Kelly Vuong, and I am a resident of Overland Park, Kansas, a nurse with nearly 20 years of experience in pediatric care, and most importantly, a mother. I writing to you today to express my strong opposition to SB 63 and HB 2071, which would ban gender-affirming care for transgender youth.

As a healthcare professional, I have seen firsthand the importance of providing compassionate, evidence-based care to children and adolescents. Gender-affirming care is supported by every major medical organization in the United States, including the American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Medical Association, as a safe, effective, and lifesaving practice. These interventions are not taken lightly—they are made in consultation with teams of medical and mental health professionals to ensure the child's best interests.

The stakes for transgender youth could not be higher. According to The Trevor Project's 2023 National Survey on LGBTQ Youth Mental Health, 41% of transgender and nonbinary youth seriously considered suicide, and nearly 20% attempted suicide in the past year. By contrast, access to gender-affirming care has been shown to significantly reduce these risks. A study published in Pediatrics found that transgender youth who received puberty blockers were 70% less likely to consider suicide compared to those who did not have access to this care.

Additionally, lack of access to affirming care and support can be devastating. 85% of transgender and nonbinary youth report that their mental health is negatively impacted by debates and policies restricting their rights. Denying this care would strip away a critical lifeline for these youth, forcing them to endure unnecessary pain and hardship.

On a personal note, as a mother, I cannot imagine being told that I cannot seek the care my child needs to thrive. Families should be trusted to make these deeply personal decisions without government interference. Legislating away this care is not about protecting children; it is about politicizing their health and well-being.

I urge you to listen to the voices of medical experts, parents, and—most importantly—the transgender youth whose lives will be directly affected by these bills. Please vote against SB 63 and HB 2071 and send a message that Kansas values all children, no matter who they are. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Testimony as opponent to HB 2071

January 27, 2025

Submitted by: Kelly J. Wall

I am writing as an opponent to HB 2071, the “Help not Harm Act”. I am writing as a mother and as a retired speech-language pathologist who has worked in public schools and as a home visitor in the early childhood programs of Kansas.

I believe we need to listen to the advice of the AMA. The American Medical Association (AMA) urged governors to oppose state legislation that would prohibit medically necessary gender transition-related care for minor patients, calling such efforts “a dangerous intrusion into the practice of medicine.” In a letter to the National Governors Association (NGA), the AMA cited evidence that trans and non-binary gender identities are normal variations of human identity and expression, and that forgoing gender-affirming care can have tragic health consequences, both mental and physical. “Decisions about medical care belong within the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship,” the AMA wrote in its letter in a press release dated April 26, 2021.

As an educator, I met children in homes, day care settings and schools, who expressed themselves in their play, manner of dressing and feelings that others might find outside of gender conforming norms.

Also from the AMA letter, “Transgender individuals are up to three times more likely than the general population to report or be diagnosed with mental health disorders, with as many as 41.5 percent reporting at least one diagnosis of a mental health or substance use disorder.<sup>1</sup> The increased prevalence of these mental health conditions is widely thought to be a consequence of minority stress, the chronic stress from coping with societal stigma, and discrimination because of one’s gender identity and expression. Because of this stress, transgender minors also face a significantly heightened risk of suicide.”

I have witnessed loving care given to very young children who may identify as transgender. All children have their best chance to thrive when shown support and acceptance, including obtaining the health care they need.

Transgender children must be given the opportunity to explore their gender identity under the safe and supportive care of a loving environment, including their family, caregivers, educators and physician, without fear of retribution or punishment.

I urge you to vote against HB 2071 and leave health care in the hands of qualified professionals.

January 24, 2025

Rep. Will Carpenter, Chair, Kansas House of Representatives Committee on Health and Human Services  
[Will.Carpenter@house.ks.gov](mailto:Will.Carpenter@house.ks.gov) (also sent to [health.human.services@house.ks.gov](mailto:health.human.services@house.ks.gov))

Rep. Carpenter,

I am writing to express concerns regarding HB 2071 that is being considered in a Committee hearing on Tuesday, January 28, 2025. This bill is important to me because I value equitable healthcare access, and believe that youth who are experiencing gender dysphoria should have the freedom to make medical and personal decisions with their parents, doctors, therapists, and faith leaders, just like all other Kansans.

**I urge you to oppose to HB 2071 for the following reasons:**

- The bill inappropriately and unnecessarily denies liberty and personal autonomy to transgender youth and their families while failing to accomplish an identified, compelling public interest.
- This extreme bill is not only about surgical intervention, it restricts even safe, fully reversible interventions and social transition activities.
- This bill is discriminatory in that it prohibits specific medical treatments for only a portion of the youth population (transgender, but not cisgender).
- This bill violates the liberty of healthcare professionals to act in accordance with the ethics of their profession in delivering well-established, evidence-based standards of care to their patients.
- The adoption of this bill into law would erode general public welfare by unduly penalizing medical providers, mental health counselors and other people who are dedicated to caring for our youth. This will further exacerbate the shortage of healthcare providers and educators in the state, and leave our vulnerable youth adrift without a safety net.

Medical organizations representing doctors, researchers, and mental health professionals support the provision of age-appropriate, gender-affirming care for transgender and non-binary people according to standards that have existed for decades. There is a preponderance of evidence, confirmed in multiple studies, that accepting trans youth and providing age-appropriate care ensures the best health outcomes. The specific values of the individuals involved, and the professional expertise and well-regulated ethics and practices of healthcare providers, can be brought to bear without government interference. And the social institutions of which the child is a part can support those decisions in a continuum of care.

If there is empirical evidence of a public safety concern, less intrusive options exist to mediate the co-existence of transgender citizens. For example, I have heard some people may fear the presence of transgender people in single-sex restroom facilities. If there are widespread incidents of legitimate public safety concern in Kansas, then please adopt laws to allow the same protections for transgender and non-binary citizens as cisgender citizens, such as requiring an “any gender” private bathroom or shower stall in public facilities as part of the building code or accessibility standards.

Please limit the scope of governance and support the principal that every person has a fundamental right to access the health care they need without fear of discrimination, prejudice, or barriers to treatment that supports their mental, physical and emotional well-being. Please help transgender youth and their families by opposing this extreme and discriminatory bill, ensuring better health outcomes for these youth.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kelly Drake Woodward, AICP  
McLouth, KS 66054

House Committee on Public Health and Human Services

Rep. Will Carpenter

Kiernan McCarty

Private Citizen

Opponent Testimony, Written Only

Chair Carpenter and Members of the Committee,

When I first began to visit Kansas, I had a profoundly positive experience with a local farmer. All the names in this story have been changed to preserve the privacy of the people mentioned. When I was sixteen, just as I had started Hormone Replacement Therapy, I took a trip out to Grainfield, KS to hang out with my three friends and see the old Victorian house that my best friend's mom was working on at the time. We had planned to take a trip out to see her cousin, a cattle farmer out in the country, while we were visiting. We spent the day traveling around to see rock structures, abandoned school houses, and little museums and gift shops in the remote plains of Northwest Kansas. This is where I learned about the true beauty that Kansas holds, that which most people who are from where I am from tend to dismiss.

When we returned back to the farm, there was a storm rolling in, but we still had some time before the rain. The man who owned this farm, Jack, was my best friend at the time's second cousin (he was her mom's cousin). Before the storm, he asked me and my three friends "who wants to drive the tractor?" No one else jumped at the chance and I had never driven a tractor before, so I volunteered and followed him outside. While I stood in the driveway, waiting for him to bring the tractor around I saw my friend's mom, Jane, in the distance. I watched as she pulled him aside and explained something to him nervously. I couldn't hear what she was telling him, but I had a pit in my stomach.

I knew where this conversation could have been going, so I tuned out, walked out of earshot, and tried to ignore it. At the time, I was not someone who would ever fathom saying “no, actually I changed my mind,” to something as petty as a tractor ride. I knew I was strong and I could handle this if it got confrontational, so I got up in the tractor with Jack. At first, things were normal and fine. He let me sit in the driver’s seat, shift the gears, showed me how to steer as I kept watch on the digital map of the crop field. When I was getting the hang of things and it fell silent he said, “you know, Jane told me something before you got in this tractor with me here.” I could feel my blood pressure rise again as I listened attentively. He continued, “she told me ‘she’s got this gender thing going on’ and I told her ‘I don’t really care about any of that gender stuff.’” My heart was racing but as he continued on talking, I began to feel more present. He said, “you know Paul McCartney was big back in my time and he would talk a lot about the virtues of being vegetarian. I respected his decision to do that, because he’s in the city, but out here in the country, things are different.” Jack went on to explain to me how he could respect people in the cities, who have different knowledge, societal, and cultural experiences, but he wouldn’t change for them and he wouldn’t expect them to change for him, either. He didn’t care what my “gender thing” was because as far as he was concerned, I looked and sounded like a young man, so he’s going to go off the assumption that I’m a young man.

I felt a wave of relief wash over me as I listened to Jack explain. At that moment, I knew I was safe. I wasn’t understood, but I didn’t need to be understood. I just needed to be respected by a man who I was alone with, in the middle of rural Kansas, in a large machine. I knew that after that conversation, I’d go back to my friends and everything would be ok. That night, Jack and his wife made us dinner. We all ate together and left to go back to Grainfield. The next couple days, I could count on being able to go home to my mom and dad, who I could tell about the experience, without judgement. We would talk it out and laugh about it, but I also had to tell my friend that her mom almost put me in a really awkward, possibly even dangerous situation that day by outing me to someone who was a complete stranger to me.

The most frustrating part of all of this is the fact that she felt the need to tell her cousin my personal business, as if “I’m Gender-Confused” was written on my forehead. I can theorize all day, but I won’t know what her thought process was unless I ask her why she felt the need to tell him about my gender transition. My friends who are nonbinary and transgender who don’t “pass” in public as the gender they identify as don’t have this same privilege of safety that I have. The only reason I was able to feel safe and confident in this scenario is because I had begun Hormone Replacement Therapy several months before and was already looking and sounding like a man. I don’t personally think I look or sound like a man. I think I look and sound like myself. I think if I hadn’t undergone Hormone Replacement Therapy, I would still look and sound like myself. I didn’t transition to be someone I’m not. I transitioned because it made sense to me. My parents supported me because it made sense to them. Life is full of choices and decisions that we make for ourselves that make the most sense to us at the time. We should be able to make those informed decisions in a country that prides itself on freedom.

After meeting Jack and spending that whole day exploring Kansas, he’d always say hi to me when he would visit my friend’s family. He’d chat with me about music and ask what I’m doing with my life. He tragically passed away in 2021 after a miserable battle with cancer, but I remember him as that guy who showed me the beauty of the rural Kansas plains and the people living here. Be more like Jack, regulate your own self and your families and please stop trying to regulate other people’s personal decisions and beliefs. That’s not what the Constitution was written for. I urge you to please vote NO on HB 2071.



Kim Bellemere  
Private Citizen  
kbellemere@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Kim Bellemere and I am a voter in rural Leavenworth County. I am writing to respectfully ask you to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I am the mother of a remarkable transgender woman. She is strong, smart, and beautiful. She is also healthy and thriving - which might not have been the case if she did not have access to the health care she needed as a minor.

Trans-focused health care is based on research and evidence, it is safe, and it is life-saving. The medical care provided to transgender minors follows well-research, science-based treatment protocols, the development of which is based on hundreds of studies with thousands of transgender individuals. That is why EVERY major medical association in the United States opposes bills like SB 63 and HB 2071.

Patients, their parents, and healthcare providers are the only ones who should be involved in the treatment of a transgender person. Legislators do not belong in exam rooms and it certainly isn't anyone's place to stand between a parent and the providers who can help their child. To do so, means willfully ignoring scientific evidence, the expertise of professionals, and the testimony of the majority of trans people themselves, and instead, giving in to one's personal biases and opinions.

My husband and I could not be more proud of our daughter and I am thankful everyday for the medical and emotional support she received when she came out as trans. Life is already needlessly difficult for trans people. There is no reason to make it worse by inserting oneself into their medical care for no legitimate reason whatsoever.

Thank you for considering my request. Once again, I encourage you to support your transgender constituents and vote no on SB 63 and HB 2071.

Kim Wilburn  
Private citizen  
kflenker@hotmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Kim Wilburn and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

The primary reason for my opposition to this bill is that gender-affirming care is life-saving care. We know that medical care for gender dysphoria is evidence-based, medically necessary, and safe. This is why every major medical association advocates against bills like this. Research shows that more trans and nonbinary teens attempted suicide after states passed anti-trans laws than during the time period prior to the passage of such laws. (Lee, W.Y., Hobbs, J.N., Hobaica, S. et al. State-level anti-transgender laws increase past-year suicide attempts among transgender and non-binary young people in the USA. *Nat Hum Behav* 8, 2096–2106 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01979-5>) The legislature should not be in the business of knowingly putting more children in harm's way. Moving this bill forward will have that effect.

I also oppose this bill because I believe that patients, their families, and their chosen medical provider(s) should have the freedom to make their own private medical decisions, without politicians standing in the way. Gender-affirming care plans are designed to meet the needs of each patient, are reliant on an evidence-based model of assessment, and the informed consent of all involved parties. This is already required by law, and there is no need to change it.

Finally, it seems worth a reminder that this bill already failed last year because it has an extremely broad reach which goes beyond the healthcare space, including enabling attacks on public employees. This bill is overly vague and does not define what "promote," "provide," or "advocate" mean, such that not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it also has the potential to disrupt the life-saving work of school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, and so on, if they interact with trans youth. The language of this bill clearly discriminates against transgender Kansans, while also raising constitutional concerns about state employees' rights to free speech.

Once again, I thank you for hearing my thoughts on this bill and encourage you all to vote no on the passage of SB 63/HB 2071. Thank you.

Krista Danielson  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
kdanielsonrolles@gmail.com  
1/25/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Committee, thank you for considering my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Krista Danielson and I vote in Riley County. I am writing today to encourage you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

Parents and doctors should have the freedom to make choices that are best for their own family's situation. One size does not fit all. These decisions are private, and should be made by the family and doctors, not by politicians.

Kansas has historically stood for dignity and freedom -- this harkens back to Abolition. However, SB 63 / HB 2071 actively revoke dignity. This bill already failed last year because of its extremely broad reach beyond the healthcare space, such as enabling attacks on public employees. The bill does not define what it means to "promote," "provide," or "advocate" for social transition or gender affirming medical care—meaning not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it could also disrupt school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, etc., who interact with trans youth. I, for one, am terrified by this possibility. This is NOT the Kansas way of treating people.

Finally, gender-affirming care is life-saving care. Medical care for gender dysphoria is evidence-based, medically necessary, and safe—which is why every major medical association advocates against bills like this. Also, everyone's bodies -- and hormonal systems -- function differently, meaning that it's impossible to legislate what's "best" or "true".

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Kristen Blackton  
Private Citizen  
krosekauf@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee,

My name is Kristen Blackton, and I am a Kansan from Shawnee in Johnson County. Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony in opposition to HB 2071.

I am a former educator, and over my ten years in the classroom, I had several former students who are part of the LGBTQ community, including some who are transgender. I have seen firsthand how support and acceptance from adults has a positive impact on young people as they navigate their identities. This includes support of these young people's ability, with the help of their families and doctors, to make decisions about their own gender-affirming care. These students, along with the other transgender youth and adults in Kansas, are real human beings with real emotions who need access to this type of healthcare for their own well-being.

I believe, as I think you do, that deeply personal medical decisions should be made by patients and their families and doctors. HB 2071 takes away that medical autonomy from youth and their families. I know that you value freedom. Please let these young people keep the freedom to make choices about their own health.

Thank you for reading my testimony and hearing my thoughts. I urge you to vote NO on the passage of HB 2071 to protect some of the most vulnerable people in our state. Thank you.

Kyle D. Million  
Private citizen  
millionbarney@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

"Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Jane Smith and I am a voter in Shawnee County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

I am tired of seeing the fear and abuse of children by hate bills such as this. All this bill will accomplish is more suicides and harm. Everyone deserves the right to pursue their own happiness as it is fundamental to our constitution!

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

**Date:** January 25, 2025

**To:** House Committee on Health and Human Services

**From:** Laura Gunderson, LMSW

**RE:** WRITTEN-ONLY Testimony in Opposition of HB 2071

Committee Members,

I want to thank you for this opportunity to write to you at the start of the Kansas 2025 legislative session. I am writing to you as a private citizen of Manhattan, Kansas, and as an outpatient therapist based in Junction City, Kansas. I am concerned for the wellbeing of my transgender and gender diverse, adolescent clients, and therefore, urge you to vote no on the passage of HB 2071, a proposed bill that would limit patients, their families, and their healthcare providers from making private, and medically-necessary decisions about an adolescent's medical care.

Like similar bills proposed last year, HB 2071 puts transgender and gender diverse youth, their families, and their healthcare providers at risk. As a social worker, I have witnessed firsthand how access to gender affirming care positively impacts transgender and gender diverse youth. Research shows us that when this population has access to gender affirming care, their overall mental health outcomes and psychological well being improve, including lessened symptoms of depression and anxiety. To make such care illegal would have detrimental impacts on Kansan transgender youth and their families.

HB 2071 also harms healthcare providers for following the ethics of their professions. In the social work profession, our Code of Ethics guides us to support transgender and gender diverse adolescents in making their own informed medical decisions in congruence with their guardians and medical professionals. Other fields recognize gender affirming care to be ethical, evidence-based, safe, and medically necessary too— every major medical association recognizes these standards. Healthcare professionals should not be forced to choose between following professional standards, ethics, and morals, or the opposing standards of the state.

Like last year's bills, HB 2071 is concerningly broad in wording and intent, raising further concerns regarding potential overstep of legislative authority.

Healthcare for transgender youth is evidence-based, safe, medically necessary, and is managed through lawful assessment and informed consent of guardians. Each person should have the right to self determination, and the freedom to make their own private, informed, medical decisions without interference from the government. For minors, this process involves the informed consent and expertise of their guardians and healthcare providers.

Thank you all for taking the time to read my testimony. I urge you to vote no on the passage of HB 2071.

Sincerely,

Laura Gunderson, LMSW, Constituent of KS House District #66

Laura Hutter  
Private Citizen  
laurahutter@hopeharbortherapy.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Laura Hutter, and I am a voter in Riley County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071

I have been providing therapy services to Kansans for the past 9 years. In my time as a therapist, I have worked with many youth and adults who are part of the LGBTQ+ community.

During my work with these people, I have witnessed mental health symptoms increase in severity when these clients are discriminated against and when they are denied affirming care. I have worked with adolescents who attempted suicide and who engaged in self-harm when their families denied them affirming care and affirming treatment. I have worked with adults who have increased anxiety and depression symptoms when interacting with others who deny and/or vilify their existence.

Conversely, I have seen adolescents whose depressive symptoms reduced when their family treats them with respect by affirming who they say they are. I have worked with adults who report feeling more safe, less anxious, and less depressed when surrounded by an affirming community.

I think we can agree that we all want to protect the health and well-being of our children. As you can see through my experiences, gender-affirming care can be literally life-saving.

Lastly, it is my hope that as a new mother, that if my son tells me that he is part of the LGBTQ+ community, he will feel safe, loved, and accepted - not only in our home, but in the broader community - including at the political level. I will do everything in my power to make sure my son feels accepted so that he does not feel the desire to self-harm, or God forbid, end his life. He is the most precious thing to me. Please don't make it harder for me to protect his mental and emotional well-being in the future if he is part of the LGBTQ+ community.

Thank you again for taking the time to read about why I oppose SB 63 / HB 2071. I encourage you all to vote no. Thank you.



---

January 28, 2025

Laurel Burchfield  
Advocacy Director  
contact@mainstream.vote

House Committee on Health and Human Services  
Chair, Rep. Will Carpenter

Re: Opposition Testimony, Written-only  
HB2071—"Enacting the help not harm act..."

Chair Carpenter and Members of the Committee,

Mainstream was founded over 30 years ago by faith leaders who warned about the intrusion of narrow, extremist religious views into our government and public institutions. In the following decades, Mainstream members have fought to protect our religious freedoms and maintain strong church-state separation because Kansans value their freedom to live as they see fit without the overreach of government or religion into their personal lives.

In HB2071 we see a national agenda to define gender and control transgender bodies based on a narrow biblical perspective come to Kansas. This effort failed in 2024 because Kansans did not want the government telling them what to do with their bodies or dictating how we raise our children. It needs to fail again.

**Mainstream opposes HB2071.** This bill discriminates against transgender Kansans and inserts the government into private healthcare decisions that should be left to the family and their medical team. HB2071 dangerously seeks to undermine science and established healthcare standards and instead aims to govern Kansans on the basis of prejudice and intolerance.

While this bill may appear to only target access to medically necessary care for transgender people under 18, the language is so broad that it could have significant additional harmful consequences for those who encounter transgender youth in their personal and professional lives. HB2071 does not define what it means to "promote," "provide," or "advocate" for social transition or gender affirming medical care. Not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it could also disrupt the lives of others who interact with trans youth, including but not limited to school counselors and teachers.

Everyone has a right to access healthcare without discrimination and government overreach. Private, medically necessary health care decisions should be kept solely between the impacted individuals, their health professionals and, if appropriate, their faith leader.



Transgender Kansans and their loved ones have testified that limiting their access to care is harmful, and potentially life-threatening. We should be listening to our neighbors and friends when they tell us they will suffer if HB2071 becomes law, not hand-picked outside consultants with no personal connections to Kansas or transgender individuals.

**Mainstream urges you to reject HB2071. Please do not turn personal, private healthcare decisions into partisan political tactics.**

Laurelin Perkins  
Private Citizen  
laurelinperkins@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Laurelin Perkins and I am a voter in Sedgwick County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

Currently kids trans care isn't going to hurt them. It's puberty blockers. And with Trans youth being a marginal percentage, bills like this waste tax dollars. There are approximately 2,100 trans youth in Kansas. These bills will do more than disrupt the lives of 2,000 people.

Children with precocious puberty need the blockers and are not trans. It's to stop children too young from going into puberty.

Male children presenting with gynecomastia, which affects 50% of 12-16 year olds are also put on these same puberty blockers.

This needs to be left to the doctors treating their patients and not law makers. This is the THIRD time a bill similar to this has been brought up and we've asked time and time again. Listen to your constituents.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you."

I feel moved to share testimony regarding the proposed restrictions on gender-affirming care for Kansas minors in SB 63. As a Kansan belonging to a trans family, I know firsthand how difficult it is for trans folks to get the care they desperately need. Adding another barrier will put lives at risk. Transgender teenagers who don't receive gender-affirming care face significant risks. Without this care, they are more likely to experience severe gender dysphoria, which can lead to depression, anxiety, and even suicidal thoughts. Gender-affirming care, such as puberty blockers and hormone therapy, helps align their physical appearance with their gender identity, reducing these mental health issues. It's crucial to provide supportive and affirming environments for transgender youth to ensure their well-being and safety. Let's help these folks instead of forcing them out of our state.

Laurie Horn  
Private Citizen  
lhorn123@gmail.com  
1/26/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Laurie Horn and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071

I have friends who raised a son all the way through college. The father was a football coach & was a very "traditional" father figure. The son never felt comfortable being a male & finally underwent transgender surgery last summer. She finally feels like the person she always was inside. It was very difficult for the parents to accept this, but they wanted their child to be happy & feel complete. Isn't that what all of us want for our family members? Please consider this situation as an example of so many others who are trapped in this situation.

I appreciate you reading my insights and I encourage you all to vote NO of the passage of SB63/HB 2071. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Greetings, House

I am unclear why our government feels it should interfere in the lives of our LGBTQIA+ community and their families and doctors. Isn't the desire of the youth enough to move towards them becoming the person they know themselves to be? I knew at a young age that I was different from my school counterparts, although I had no words or idea why.

Taking this into our laws rips the ability of young people to become who they know they are. What business is it of our elected officials? If the youth, their parents and their doctors are in agreement, where is the harm? Do you believe that parents are forcing their kids to become trans? That is faulty thinking and will leave the youth hanging between what should be available to them and what is denied.

Why would you do that? Why would you think you have a right or need to do that? How do we convince you that you are wrong? Have any of you sat with a trans youth or adult? Have you taken the time to reason together to understand? The world is not simply male and female. There is a sliding scale of gender identities.

Those who have no identifiable gender, those who have both genders, and all things in between. If you are unaware of these citizens, then why are you making rules for this community? You obviously need to further educate yourselves before making their lives unchangeable and miserable.

I am opposed to any laws regarding the medical decisions of trans youth to transition, with insight from their families and their doctors. Leave them alone, especially if you refuse to try and understand their plight. That is simply being a bully and believing that what you envision is righteous and true for everyone.

No one needs this type of government interference into their lives. Give them a chance to grow into the person they understand they are, not the one you want to make them become.

Sincerely,  
Laurie Todd  
Olathe, Ks 66061

Written Only  
In Opposition  
HB 2071

Leslie D. Mark  
Private Citizen  
ldmark61@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Chair and All Committee Members, thank you for taking time to read and consider my thinking about SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Leslie Mark, I live and vote in Johnson County. I write today encouraging each of you committee members to vote NO on SB 63 | HB 2071.

Medical decisions can be relatively simple & straightforward — and they may be utterly fraught! Many diagnoses are only made after a team of people have reviewed all the data from and talking with a patient. Figuring out what to do with that information happens with a team of medical, family and community support for the patient. But, in any case, folks should have the freedom to make their own medical decisions informed by the doctors they trust.

Reading over this proposed legislation, it's obviously shaded by draconian ideas regarding trans people. Why are we seeking to define, restrict and disable folks in their medical healthcare and beyond?. It doesn't define what it means to "promote," "provide," or "advocate" for social transition or gender affirming medical care, thus one might infer that mental and medical health professionals will be impacted by this bill, as well as school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, or really just everyone who might happen to interact with trans youth.

My nephew's gender-affirming care was life-saving care. He leaned on kind, supportive and knowledgeable folks from all walks of his life to sustain and nurture him through very challenging high school years. What our family learned is that medicine has evolved over decades to offer evidence-based, medically necessary, and safe "best practices" when treating gender dysphoria. This is why, no doubt, every major medical association opposes boilerplate legislation from national bill mills like this one. As decent Kansas people with good medical care systems, we absolutely know better than this.

Thanks for reading through my testimony and thoughts on SB 63 | HB 2071. Please vote NO.

Dear Committee Members,

My name is Lilly McElroy and I am an educator living in Lawrence. I am writing to you today to ask that you do not pass bills like HB 2071 which would negatively impact transgender youth by restricting their access to healthcare information and limiting the support they can receive in their communities. Suppressing social transition does not help youth but instead actively harms them. We need to make sure that we are supporting young people instead of passing bills that would make their lives harder.

Not only do I fear that this bill will cause people pain and suffering, but I fear that it will curtail our First Amendment rights.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Lilly McElroy

Lindsey Landholm

I am a private citizen, I identify as non binary and believe I and many others deserve to have the gender affirming care and treatment that they deserve!

Lindseylandholm1@gmail.com

1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071

Opponent

Written only

Thank you for listening to us on this subject and I encourage that you look further into this bill

I believe legislation should be against this bill banning my ability to express myself the way I wish, this would not happen to cisgender people, yet it effects them as well.

Thank you for hearing me out, please consider your position on this, think of me and the other trans youth who wish to have a fulfilling life as the person they are.



Lisa Wright  
PFLAG Kansas City, Chapter President  
lisa.leann.wright@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2072 with you. My name is Lisa Wright and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 /HB 2071.

Please do not take away the power of parents and doctors of trans, nonbinary and gender nonconforming youth to have the necessary healthcare they need. Trans, nonbinary, and all gender-nonconforming youth deserve to feel safe, celebrated, empowered, and loved—period. Please do not be afraid of what you do not understand. These children just want to live. If you would like real information about LGBTQ youth, please go to [PFLAG.org](http://PFLAG.org).

I thank you for hearing my thoughts on this matter and I encourage you all to vote NO of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071.

Liz Hamor  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
liz.hamor@centerofdaring.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Kansas Legislators,

Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you. My name is Liz Hamor and I'm a voter, parent, business owner, Leadership Consultant, and Christian in a more rural part of Sedgwick County.

SB 63 / HB 2071 are harmful bills. Not only would these bills cause harm to individual children, but bills like this have statistically been shown to cause widespread community harm, both in the form of more anxiety, depression and suicidality for trans youth and adults (see link below for one source) AND by empowering stochastic terrorism. Stochastic terrorism is defined as, "the public demonization of a person or group resulting in the incitement of a violent act, which is statistically probable but whose specifics cannot be predicted."

Bills like SB 63 / HB 2071 contribute to the public demonization of transgender kids which contributes to violence toward them.

As a longtime LGBTQ+ advocate, I have been writing opposition testimony to bills attacking the rights of transgender youth since 2015. I have witnessed the increasing hostility coming at trans youth from both legislation and our society. For over TEN YEARS, our elected officials have been legislatively attacking transgender youth and setting a precedent for society to do the same. This animosity and state-sanctioned harm needs to stop.

Thank you for considering letting parents and qualified medical professionals decide what is best for children and limiting government intrusion.

If you value harm reduction and the sanctity of all life, please let your actions align with those values and vote a resounding NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

<https://www.apa.org/topics/lgbtq/mental-health-anti-transgender-legislation>

Logan Pinedo  
Leavenworth Family Pride  
logan.hollowpine@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Logan Pinedo and I am a voter in Leavenworth County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071

I am in opposition to these bills not only on a Constitutional level but also on a personal level. The world is a complicated place. Minors may seek guidance from their parents, healthcare professionals, spiritual or religious leaders, or other trusted individuals to find the path to their own identity. Government officials passing bills such as these does not help these youth to grow and flourish as is their human right. In fact, such bills discriminate specifically against transgender youth while allowing cisgender youth access to the same healthcare and social acceptance.

As a nonbinary adult who could have benefited from earlier social transition, I believe allowing transgender youth to be their authentic selves, especially during adolescence - an already confusing and emotional time in their young lives, is crucial. Had my parents had the resources and education during my early childhood into adolescence, I believe I would have avoided a lot of unnecessary traumas throughout my life.

The ability to make gender-affirming decisions, such as my hair style and wardrobe, has allowed me to live a more productive, happy, and fulfilling life, enabling me to provide for my family and community in a manner I never could have otherwise. Although gender-affirming medical care is much more involved than a haircut, both social and medical transitions are examples of care that lets people be who they want to be. What makes America great is the ability for our citizens to make decisions for themselves. Transgender youth deserve the same opportunities as the rest of the citizens of our great nation.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill. I implore you to look deep within your souls and recognize the opportunity and responsibility you have to vote in a manner that allows our citizens to carve their own path. Please vote no on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

To: House Health and Human Services Committee  
(Health.Human.Services@house.ks.gov)

Dear Committee member,

I am a Kansan living in Lawrence, and I urge you to reject HB 2071. I am an older mom and a couple of my friends have children who are trans, and a relative of mine, now in their thirties, is also trans. I adore these trans individuals and shudder to think what their lives would have been like if they hadn't had access to good gender-affirming medical care when they needed it or hadn't had supportive family members and caring teachers who affirmed them for who they are. The healthcare for minors that this bill bans is safe and saves lives. Every major medical association advocates *against* bills like this one.

Gender affirming healthcare should be available to all who need it when they need it. This bill will hurt young people who need care, will stress families who want care for their children, and will stress providers whose job it is to provide the best evidence-based healthcare possible. I don't want this bill, Kansans don't want this bill, and I urge you to reject it.

Sincerely  
Lora Jost  
Lawrence, KS

Lucille Buller  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
lgracebuller@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me space to share my thoughts as your constituent on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Lucille Buller and I am a voter in Harvey County. I am writing to strongly encourage you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

My freshman year of college I met a trans man named Tristan. Tristan is one of many trans people who experiences an increased risk of suicidal ideation. Access to gender affirming care gave Tristan the comfortability in his body and self to save him from suicide. I am writing today because this is one of many stories. Anti-trans laws lead directly to a 72% rise in suicide attempts. Gender affirming care is life saving care. As a gender non conforming person, I deserve the right to make decisions about my body and my healthcare and what will make my body safe for me. No matter their age, every person deserves a right to choice over their body and their healthcare. Gender affirming care is life saving care.

Again, thank you for listening to my story and the queer community. I encourage you to vote no on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071 to protect your LGBTQ+ constituents. Thank you.

Committee On Health and Human Services  
January 23, 2025  
House Bill 2071

Lucy Evelyn Kline  
Testimony in Opposition  
Written-Only

Chairman Carpenter and members of the Committee:

My name is Lucy Kline and I am a transgender woman residing in Wichita. I appreciate being given the opportunity to offer testimony in opposition of HB2071, which would interfere in a medical provider's ability to provide life-saving gender-affirming care to transgender youth.

Gender-affirming care (such as GnRH agonists, hormone replacement therapy, and necessary surgeries) is a critical medical resource to both transgender adults and youth alike, and have well-established standards of care as recommended by professional organizations like the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH). It is not the responsibility of the State of Kansas to instruct medical professionals on how to care for transgender patients, especially when in contradiction with widely accepted medical guidelines.

To speak personally on the matter, I believe that nobody should be forced to undergo a puberty that is misaligned with their understanding of their gender. It is a humiliating, dehumanizing, and traumatic experience that takes immense effort and financial resources to reverse in adulthood. It is an unfortunate fact that many transgender people who lack access to gender-affirming care during their adolescence do not survive to be adults. As a survivor, I urge you not to subject transgender youth to this torture and leave our medical freedoms alone.

In conclusion, I vehemently oppose HB 2071 and ask that the committee vote against it. Thank you for your time.

- Lucy Evelyn Kline

January 25, 2025

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am a Kansas voter, submitting this testimony in the hope that you do not allow HB 2071 to pass.

Simply put, this legislation would kill young Kansans. A recent study found that, among a sample of 61,240 transgender and gender nonconforming young people surveyed between 2018 and 2022, suicide attempts increased by up to 72% in states that enacted legislation similar to HB 2071 (Lee et al., 2024).

I hope that you will consider the consequences of passing this legislation and choose to protect the lives of the young people of our state instead.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

M Horowitz

#### Reference

Lee, W. Y., Hobbs, J. N., Hobacica, S., DeChants, J. P., Price, M. N., & Nath, R. (2024) State-level anti-transgender laws increase past-year suicide attempts among transgender and non-binary young people in the USA. *Nature Human Behavior*, 8, 2096-2106.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01979-5>

MACKENZIE CRIDER  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
crider.mac@gmail.com  
1/28/1994

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me grace in submitting my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is MacKenzie Crider, and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

How many of the people who represent Kansas, in its entirety, are trans? How many of you are truly friends with someone who is trans or nonbinary? How many of you have had full, actual, genuine conversations with someone who is trans? How many of you know someone who has been abused or othered because they're trans? If any of these questions make you feel a sense of being accused of something you can't quite explain, then it may be time to take a deep look in the mirror, and remember that you are representing everyone in our state. This includes children. This includes trans—and I cannot stress this enough—people. As such, gender-affirming care is HEALTHcare. It is not some silly game. If you do not understand this is as a fact, then you are not performing your duty to ALL the people you worked so hard to represent.

As a whole, we are all responsible for taking care of one another whenever we can, for the betterment of a successful and fruitful society. The beauty of our lives is found in others. I truly hope that looking inward is helpful in your decision to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.



Mackenzie McGee  
340 Indiana St  
Lawrence, KS 66044  
952-240-0561  
mackenziepeery@gmail.com

Mister Chair and Committee Members,

I'm writing to testify against HB 2071. I'm writing to you as a young woman who hopes to start a family in Kansas in the next few years. I see HB 2071 as a direct threat to me and my family's future.

HB 2071 validates the existence of gender dysphoria as a widely accepted condition, citing its definition in the DSM-5. It is disturbing enough that some Kansas lawmakers are so eager to insert themselves into doctor's offices, to ignore medical providers' expertise while limiting patient freedom to choose potentially lifesaving medical interventions. What's worse is the inconsistency of the bill providing explicit exceptions for "individuals born with a medically verifiable disorder of sex development," such as intersex children. This bill clearly acknowledges the importance of gender-affirming care while explicitly banning it. Kansas lawmakers are not equipped to determine which children should receive gender affirming care. It is a cruel, unjustified infringement on the rights of parents, children, and medical providers in the state of Kansas.

In conclusion, I urge the committee to vote against HB 2071, and to focus on ways to support all Kansans and their children, regardless of gender expression. I urge you to protect the rights of Kansans to make their own informed decisions about their families and their futures.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mackenzie McGee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Mackenzie McGee

January 26, 2025

TO: Kansas House of Representative, Health and Human Services Committee

RE: I write **in opposition** to Proposed House Bill 2071.

Decisions regarding medical care for transgender children should be left to the child, their family and their doctors. Life is hard enough for children who have gender dysphoria. Their suicide rates are tragically high. (82% of transgender people have reported considering suicide and 40% have attempted it.) What transgender children need is acceptance.

The law as written is too broad. Medical care for gender dysphoria includes a wide range of treatments. The most common, hormone blockers, is reversible, while surgery is not routinely performed before age 16. In any case, the vast majority of persons who transition are greatly relieved to have done so; there are very few who detransition.

House Bill 2071 would harm trans children, it will not help them.

Maggie Childs

Lawrence, KS

MaKinlie McRae  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
Makinliemcrae@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is MaKinlie McRae and I am a voter in Scott County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071

I am writing to express my strong opposition to any proposed legislation that seeks to restrict the rights, dignity, or freedoms of transgender individuals in Kansas. Such measures are not only harmful to the trans community, but they also undermine the values of equality, fairness, and compassion that should guide our state's laws.

Transgender individuals, like all Kansans, deserve to live with dignity and access the same opportunities and protections as everyone else. Anti-trans laws have been shown to negatively impact mental health, increase discrimination, and create unnecessary barriers in education, healthcare, and public life. This is especially concerning for transgender youth, who already face higher rates of bullying and mental health challenges.

Rather than focusing on divisive policies, we should be working together to create a Kansas that supports all its residents, celebrates diversity, and ensures that everyone feels welcome and valued. I urge you to vote no on any legislation that targets the transgender community and instead champion policies that uplift and protect all Kansans.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my perspective and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. For me, for the people I love, and for humanity as a whole. Thank you.

1/26/2025

HB 2071

Hearing Date: 1/28/2025

Written Only

Opponent

Marcel Harmon

marcelharmon@gmail.com

Private Citizen

Chair Carpenter and Members of the House Health and Human Services Committee, thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on HB 2071. My name is Marcel Harmon, and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on HB 2071.

My opposition stems from personal impacts (my youngest is trans) as well as broader social impacts. As I understand it, this bill does the following:

- **Effectively Bans All Gender Affirming Healthcare for Trans Minors:** including medical care (puberty blockers, HRT, etc.), bans state funds, including Medicaid, from being used for gender-affirming medication or surgery to trans people under 18.
- **Bans State Agencies from Affirming Trans Kids:** bans state facilities or individuals/entities receiving state funds from “promoting or advocating” social transition or gender affirming care to trans people under 18, bans state employees who “care [for] children” from providing or promoting social transition or gender-affirming care to trans people under 18.
- **Threatens Healthcare Providers:** Providers (from therapists to nurses to physicians) would be subject to strict liability lawsuits and licensure implications for violating this law and bans providers from obtaining liability insurance to protect from this.

I have previously shared in detail through past emails and articles the impacts that bills like this, and the rhetoric surrounding them, have on my family. And I refer you to the following for a detailed description of these impacts:

- [KS Legislators - Sustain an SB 233 Veto: Support the Trans Community and Trans Youth](https://marcelharmon67.substack.com/p/ks-legislators-sustain-an-sb-233) (<https://marcelharmon67.substack.com/p/ks-legislators-sustain-an-sb-233>).

Here are a few particularly relevant quotes:

- “He [our youngest who is trans] hates knowing that legislators craft legislation impacting LGBTQ individuals and vote on it without knowing what it's like to be LGBTQ, without ever having meaningful conversations with someone who's LGBTQ, or conversations with those who provide gender affirming care. He hates hearing about other trans and LGBTQ youth and people who've been harassed and attacked, or worse.”
- “He hates having that nagging fear about his safety in the back of his head when he's in public, just taking the bus, at a pride parade, etc. He hates being misgendered at work or elsewhere in public and having to weigh whether or not it's worth pointing out relative to the potential reaction that might occur. He hates having to weigh the pros and cons, that vary by location, every time he needs to decide which restroom to use when he's in public. *He hates having to worry about losing access to gender affirming care, even as an adult, because providers may decide it's just not worth it in such a hostile climate.*”
- “Some of you said this legislation isn't attacking trans people. OF COURSE it's attacking them. You are limiting the treatments available to trans youth that could make them feel whole, that could help them feel like they belong in their bodies, focusing on surgical procedures rarely used for those under 18. It completely ignores how gender affirming care is actually conducted, focusing on outliers and anecdotes. The rhetoric used in support of this (mutilation, equating gender affirming care to lobotomies [as Senator Steffon did last session], calling parents wayward) vilifies providers, trans youth, and their families. It is DESIGNED to attack the trans community.”
- The stress that parents and other family members of trans individuals feel also takes a toll. Reference the Scientific American article linked to in this piece: [Families Find Ways to Protect Their LGBTQ Kids](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/families-find-ways-to-protect-their-lgbtq-kids-from-serious-harm-physical/) - <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/families-find-ways-to-protect-their-lgbtq-kids-from-serious-harm-physical/>. “Diamond, the University of Utah psychologist, says this hypervigilant state can be devastating to parents. She has studied minority stress in members of the LGBTQ community and in their caregivers, and she believes the absence of safety erodes their mental health. The same response designed to protect humans from the proverbial saber-toothed tiger is now perpetually activated by

headlines signaling that LGBTQ kids are threatened.” For us, it’s a stress that’s always there. Fortunately for us, we have the resources and insurance available to take advantage of mental healthcare. But not every Kansan does.

Broader social impacts within our state include the following:

- **Patients, families, and their doctors should have the freedom to make their own private medical decisions—not politicians.** Gender-affirming care is individualized to meet the needs of each patient, managed through a careful and evidence-based model of assessment and informed consent—which is already required by law. No credible studies that I’m aware of show this to be untrue. Bills like this, based on anecdotes and unjustified fear as opposed to scientific evidence, override personal freedoms and the expertise of medical health providers.
- **This bill already failed last year because of its extremely broad reach beyond the healthcare space, such as enabling attacks on public employees.** The bill does not define what it means to “promote,” “provide,” or “advocate” for social transition or gender affirming medical care—meaning not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it could also disrupt school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, etc., who interact with trans youth. *As a former school board member and president, I can confidently state that such a bill will be disruptive to classroom, school, and district operations.* The language of the bill clearly discriminates against transgender Kansans and raises constitutional concerns about state employee's free speech rights. And the costs to the state of subsequent lawsuits that will arise out of such a bill will be paid in part by the taxpayer.
- **Gender-affirming care is life-saving care.** Medical care for gender dysphoria is evidence-based, medically necessary, and safe—which is why every major medical association advocates against bills like this. You will be denying Kansans such life-saving care. And for those still referencing the UK’s Cass Review, know that much of that review has been debunked. Here are a few references:
  - [The U.K.’s Cass Review Badly Fails Trans Children:   
https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-k-s-cass-review-badly-fails-trans-children/.](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-k-s-cass-review-badly-fails-trans-children/)

- [The Cass Review: Cis-supremacy in the UK's approach to healthcare for trans children: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2024.2328249.](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2024.2328249)
- [What's wrong with the Cass Review? A round-up of commentary and evidence: https://ruthpearce.net/2024/04/16/whats-wrong-with-the-cass-review-a-round-up-of-commentary-and-evidence/.](https://ruthpearce.net/2024/04/16/whats-wrong-with-the-cass-review-a-round-up-of-commentary-and-evidence/)
- [Critically Appraising the Cass Review: Methodological Flaws and Unsupported Claims: https://osf.io/preprints/osf/uhndk.](https://osf.io/preprints/osf/uhndk)
- [Biological and psychosocial evidence in the Cass Review: a critical commentary: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2024.2362304.](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2024.2362304)
- [What the Science on Gender-Affirming Care for Transgender Kids Really Shows: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-the-science-on-gender-affirming-care-for-transgender-kids-really-shows/.](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-the-science-on-gender-affirming-care-for-transgender-kids-really-shows/)
- [Over 130 Irish academics sign open letter criticising Cass Review on transgender healthcare: https://uk.news.yahoo.com/over-130-irish-academics-sign-160853418.html.](https://uk.news.yahoo.com/over-130-irish-academics-sign-160853418.html)
- [Serious Inquiries Only Podcast: Actual Experts Debunk the Cass Review: https://www.whitman-walker.org/serious-inquiries-only-podcast-actual-experts-debunk-the-cass-review/.](https://www.whitman-walker.org/serious-inquiries-only-podcast-actual-experts-debunk-the-cass-review/)
- [Endocrine Society And American Academy Of Pediatrics Respond To Cass, Reject Bans: https://www.erininthemorning.com/p/endocrine-society-and-american-academy.](https://www.erininthemorning.com/p/endocrine-society-and-american-academy)
- [British Medical Association Calls Cass Review "Unsubstantiated," Passes Resolution Against Implementation: https://www.erininthemorning.com/p/british-medical-association-calls.](https://www.erininthemorning.com/p/british-medical-association-calls)

**SCIENCE**, the natural, medical, and social sciences, they **ALL** tell us that biological sex and gender are not the same thing, and that neither are binary (a few references are below). And because of that, the physical and mental health care we make available to our young people need to reflect this reality. Please step back and look at this with some curiosity – expand what you think you know about biological sex and gender.

- Biological sex is chemically and genetically more complex than XX and XY – it isn't actually binary (and this applies to other species as well). From some of the sources out there,

those born with atypical genitalia (other terms used include intersex and ambiguous genitalia) range from 0.1% to 2%. With 8.2 billion people currently on the planet, then anywhere from 8.2 million to 164 million people currently alive today may have been born with some type of atypical genitalia. Biology, genetics, medicine, etc. do not support the statement that biological sex is binary. Here are some sources if you're interested.

- [Atypical Genitalia \(Formerly Known as Ambiguous Genitalia\):  
https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/diseases/22470-atypical-genitalia-formerly-known-as-ambiguous-genitalia.](https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/diseases/22470-atypical-genitalia-formerly-known-as-ambiguous-genitalia)
  - [What's intersex? https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/gender-identity/sex-gender-identity/whats-intersex.](https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/gender-identity/sex-gender-identity/whats-intersex)
  - [Sex Redefined: The Idea of 2 Sexes Is Overly Simplistic:  
https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sex-redefined-the-idea-of-2-sexes-is-overly-simplistic1.](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sex-redefined-the-idea-of-2-sexes-is-overly-simplistic1)
  - [Brain Sex Differences Related to Gender Identity Development: Genes or Hormones? - https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7139786/.](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7139786/)
- While some of the literature will label these occurrences as disorders, it's important to recognize that such a label, outside of the medical context (which admittedly can impact one's health depending on the specific condition), has large cultural implications – it's a value judgement. *Decisions made by parents (and adults later in life) relative to courses taken are heavily influenced by pressure to “fit” within a society that doesn't understand or even accept the reality of their conditions.* But they were born that way.
  - Gender, while influenced by biological sex, is heavily determined by cultural factors and societal norms. It is the inner sense of self as female, male, fluid, or some other alternative gender (though the specific details of how this manifests individually and collectively is still a subject of debate among experts and varies somewhat by discipline). But the social sciences overall do not support the idea that gender and biological sex are the same thing or that gender is binary. Here are some sources if you're interested.
    - [Gender is conceptualized in different ways across cultures:  
https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-and-cognition/article/gender-is-conceptualized-in-different-ways-across-cultures/88A19740AE09E6299B9836158053B57F.](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-and-cognition/article/gender-is-conceptualized-in-different-ways-across-cultures/88A19740AE09E6299B9836158053B57F)
    - [Sociology of Gender: https://othersociologist.com/sociology-of-gender/.](https://othersociologist.com/sociology-of-gender/)



- [Brain Sex Differences Related to Gender Identity Development: Genes or Hormones? https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7139786/.](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7139786/)
- [Adding Some Curiosity to Common Sense: https://marcelharmon67.substack.com/p/adding-some-curiosity-to-common-sense.](https://marcelharmon67.substack.com/p/adding-some-curiosity-to-common-sense)

I would encourage you to have some heartfelt discussions with constituents who are trans, who are allies, and who are providers of gender affirming care. Read up on this. Delve through the information provided by the large number of opponents of this bill (from this session and past sessions), some of which explicitly debunks proponent testimony. Don't just rely on the limited information provided by the bill's small number of proponents (most out of state and many paid to provide their testimony, at least in past sessions). And recognize that the medical professionals among the legislature promoting this bill have no experience in gender affirming care.

Once again, I thank you all for reviewing my thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no on the passage of HB 2071 out of committee.

Margaret Schrader-Ford  
Private Citizen  
margaret.schrader715@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and members of the board, thank you for giving me the time to share my thoughts on SB 63/ HB 2071. My name is Margaret Schrader-Ford and I am a voter in Shawnee County. I am writing today to urge the committee to vote NO on SB 63/ HB 2071.

I say this because I have met and worked with numerous trans, intersex, and nonbinary people. One of the staff members at the school I work with was trans, and he was amazing with the kids and parents. The students and staff loved him. Also one of my son's best friends is trans, and that child is very secure in who he is—he is not confused, no one is putting ideas in his head, and living his truth as a trans boy has been crucial to his healthy development. These are real people, their lives matter, and saying you know what's best for them is not only dangerous and harmful, but truly asinine. None of us get to decide what someone's identity is.

Once again, I thank you for hearing my perspective and thoughts on this bill, and I urge you to vote no on the passage of SB 63/ HB 2071. Thank you very much.

Honorable Committee Members,

My name is Mark Bricker and I live in Oberlin, KS. I have lived in western Kansas my entire life. I have been an educator for 31 years. I am also a part time farmer. My wife and I had difficulties with fertility. Needless to say, I was very excited and proud when our first child was born. I remember very well when my child was about 5 and they expressed their desire not to be a female but rather a male. I told my child about all the positive attributes of the female gender trying to convince my child that there was nothing wrong with being a girl. About a year later, my wife and I discovered that our child had used some scissors to cut an unnoticeable amount of their long hair. I didn't realize at the time why. About a year later, my child told me that they really wanted to be a boy. We had many discussions about this. I knew that the prospect of my child wanting to be a boy would create a very difficult and challenging future. I worry about how my child is teased in school. I worry about what others feel and say about my child wanting to feel comfortable with who they are. I still worry about my child's future. I worry about my child being accepted for who they are.

I'd like to talk about HB 2071. This bill is important to me because I believe it makes a difficult situation worse. This bill exacerbates the negative view that some people in society have about those who want to feel comfortable with who they are. I do not understand the reasoning behind parts of this bill. I think I do understand why some people would be scared of my child. I believe it is human nature to be afraid of what you don't understand. It is prevalent in our history. I believe my child is happy with who they are. Would I prefer my child not to be transgender? Absolutely. Only because I know my child will have challenges with some individuals in society that fear the stereotypes that they perceive in the media of transgenders. Have I accepted their decision to pursue happiness and feel comfortable about who they are? Absolutely. My child is now much happier and more confident. Many people have made this comment. I really wish that you could get to know my child. I am proud of him.

I ask you to vote against HB 2071. Make it a goal to find someone who is transgender. Talk to them. Ask them if they are happy with who they are. If I have failed to convince you to vote no, please explain to me why you are against my son's right in the pursuit of happiness. His constitutional right to pursue his own goals and desires.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mark Bricker

MARSHALL SHUMAN  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
marsh.shuman@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time and opportunity to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Marshall shuman and I am a voter in Sedgwick County. I am writing today to urge the committee to to VOTE NO on SB 63 / HB 2071

The bill does not define what it means to "promote," "provide"" or "advocate" for social transition or gender affirming medical care - meaning not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it could also disrupt school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, etc., who interact with trans youth. The language of the bill clearly discriminates against transgender Kansans and raises constitutional concerns about state employee's free speech rights.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing what I have to say and I encourage you all to VOTE NO on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Mary Fluker

Regarding the Committee on Public Health and Welfare

January 26, 2025

My name is Mary Fluker and I am a concerned Lawrencian resident.

I am testifying to insist that HB 2071 should not be passed as it would only serve to harm the children it claims to protect.

For the past two years, my husband and I have volunteered with gay and trans youth in the foster system and it seems evident that accepting the gender identities they have chosen is integral to their happiness and mental well-being. Many of these children were rejected or treated negatively by their own families due to their identities.

What the "help not harm act" proposes is to reject these children further, to tell them that they are unwanted and invalid. These children see a government that wants every avenue for acceptance and understanding quashed. What do you think they see their choices to be?

The children I have volunteered with have so much potential. They are strong, and creative, and brilliant despite all they've been through. They are also deeply scared of what the new presidential term may mean for them.

One of the most important things to get children through the system and into adulthood, from my observations, is to help them envision their own future. When we reject children like them and codify it as law, that future becomes more difficult for them to see.

The children we volunteer with are in the foster system because adults in their lives have failed them. Please do not fail them further.

Thank you for your time

Mary Patterson, Ph.D.  
Private Citizen  
quantumgrace@hotmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee,

This is a hate bill. The people in the US have the freedom to be called any name they would choose. You cannot take away that freedom as it is unconstitutional.

Thank you for hearing my testimony.

Maxwell Driskill  
Private Citizen  
maxderpinphd@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and members of the committee, thank you pretending to care about what your voters want. My name is Maxwell Driskill and I'm writing to shame you all for your inevitable votes on SB63.

The fact that this is even being considered is an embarrassment and there are an unbelievable number of arguments against it. None of that matters though, I could point out that not only are these treatments consistently shown to cause a steep decline in suicide rates among youth with gender dysphoria, but even if the child decides against following through on the treatment puberty blockers are completely reversible. I could lay out argument after argument like this, but you don't actually care about that. Your position is, fundamentally, that transgender people are degenerate and ought be suppressed in order to promote "social hygiene." A phrase coined in Germany about 90 years ago in order to justify eerily similar policies under the same pretense of "protect our children from these foul degenerates." Later, it would be used in the Soviet Union, in order to justify purging all the homosexuals as "agents of western, capitalist corruption and degeneracy." They did this because they were weaklings and cowards. They lived in constant, unceasing fear of people that they had never met but were absolutely certain were bad. I, for one, would like to reject this cowardice. I want to reject the pathetic mewling of weaklings who are brought to tears by a group of children. I'm not asking you all to be the strongest. I'm asking you to pass the simplest test you possibly could: Not picking fights with literal children. After all, what kind of loser needs to target kids just to feel tough?

A vote for this bill is a vote for weakness. I implore you to use your vote to demonstrate Kansas' strength. Vote no.

Meaghan Petrowsky  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
Meaghanpetrowsky@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share with you my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Meaghan Petrowsky; I am a voter living in Johnson County, and I'm encouraging you today to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I oppose the passage and object to the existence of this bill because of the scientific evidence showing that gender-affirming care for transgender minors is absolutely life-saving. In a world where trans kids are under attack by everyone from TV hosts to the President of the United States, it is abhorrent to see this bill come back around again in Kansas. I have personally seen the transformative outcome that gender-affirming care can have on trans individuals. Looking down the barrel of a law that would force teachers and health-care providers to address trans youth by their deadnames or the incorrect gender, I can only say that this bill appears to have no purpose except cruelty to an exceptionally vulnerable population. I was raised by a law-enforcement agent who led me to believe that the government's role is to protect the people who cannot protect themselves. I hope that this body will consider whether you are acting in a way that protects or persecutes the most vulnerable among us.

Again, I appreciate you taking the time to consider my thoughts, and I urge you all to vote NO on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071



MEGAN LANGFORD  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
LANGFORD.MEGAN@GMAIL.COM  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairperson and Members of the Committee, thank you for allowing me to share testimony today on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Megan Langford and I am a parent and voter in Lenexa. I strongly encourage you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

Gender-affirming care is life-saving care. It is medically necessary and safe. Every major medical organization opposes bills like the ones you are proposing. It is wholly unnecessary for this body to decide what healthcare is needed. Those decisions should remain with patients, their families, and their doctors.

The world is already not a safe place for trans people. They are more at risk for violence and suicide. Receiving gender-affirming care early can help with both those issues. My trans friends are scared right now. America is turning its back on them. They just want to live their lives without hitting refresh on the news every few minutes to see what new anti-trans bill has popped up. Please just let them receive the healthcare they need.

Thank you for hearing my thoughts on this bill. Again, please vote NO on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071.

Meghan Tuttle  
Private citizen  
megtuttle@icloud.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Hello—my name is Meghan Tuttle. Thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 and HB 2071. I am a voter in Riley county and also a mental health provider. I am writing today urge the committee to vote no on these bills.

I oppose this bill from a mental health position. I know passing these will increase the mental health needs in a state that is already desperately short on providers.

Thank you again for giving me time today. And again I urge you all to vote no the the passage of SB63 and HB 2071

MEHKI WRIGHT  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
blackarrowxp58@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts and stance on SB 63 / HB 2071 today. My name is Mehki Wright and I am a voter in Sedge wick County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote against SB 63 / HB 2071.

SB 63 / HB 2071 directly puts people who are actively seeking care, currently getting care on an active care plan, the people who are in the medical field who are dedicated to making sure those who are in need of gender affirming care and mental health care as a whole at risk to an unprecedented degree. If the bill were to pass and be put into effect, it would directly effect everyone at every level. Not just people only seeking gender affirming care. The teenager who may be struggling from gender dysphoria, The psychiatrist who may be actively assisting someone with a treatment plan, or someone who may a risk to themselves, would be effected. As someone who has actively seen people close to me struggle with their own personal battle with mental health and gender affirming care. I was able to see them over come that battle and grow into amazing people in their own lives after being able to access the care and the treatment that they needed. If it were not for them being able to get proper treatment from health care professionals, I'm not sure if they would be here on this earth today with me.

Once again, I thank all of you for listening to my story and personal thoughts on this bill. I strongly encourage all of you to vote against the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071.

Melanie Wade  
Heartland Primary Care, Pediatric Nurse Practitioner  
mswade14@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Melanie Wade and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071

I oppose this bill as it places limits on life affirming care. According to The National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners (NAPNAP), research has consistently shown that LGBTQ+ children and adolescents face disproportionately higher levels of isolation, runaway behavior, homelessness, intimate partner violence, depression, anxiety, suicide, substance abuse, pregnancy, physical and emotional abuse, and academic or job-related struggles when compared to their heterosexual, cisgender peers. However, these adverse outcomes are not inevitable. They can be significantly reduced through safe, supportive, and affirming environments provided by families, health care providers, caring adults, and safe spaces at school.

Pediatric nurse practitioners (PNPs) and other pediatric-focused providers are uniquely positioned to address the specific needs of LGBTQ+ youth. By encouraging family support and creating an inclusive, affirming care environment, PNPs can help mitigate the harmful effects of stigma and discrimination, ultimately empowering LGBTQ+ individuals to thrive and reach their full potential. Passing this bill will put our youth at risk and will limit what providers can do for our patients and their healthcare.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you

Melinda Parks  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
melindaparks85@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for reading my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Melinda Parks and I am a voter in Lenexa, Kansas. I am writing today to urge you to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I firmly believe that patients, families, and their doctors should have the freedom to make their own private medical decisions—not politicians. Gender-affirming care is individualized to meet the needs of each patient, managed through a careful and evidence-based model of assessment and informed consent—which is already required by law.

The bill does not define what it means to “promote,” “provide,” or “advocate” for social transition or gender affirming medical care—meaning not only will mental and medical health professionals be impacted by this bill, but it could also disrupt school counselors, teachers, daycare providers, etc., who interact with trans youth. The language of the bill clearly discriminates against transgender Kansans and raises constitutional concerns about state employee's free speech rights.

Gender-affirming care is life-saving care. Medical care for gender dysphoria is evidence-based, medically necessary, and safe—which is why every major medical association advocates against bills like this.

Thank you for reading my thoughts on this bill. I encourage you to vote no on the SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

January 26, 2025

To: Representative Will Carpenter, Chair of House Health and Human Services

I submit this written testimony as a Mennonite pastor and as a parent of a trans adult. My faith tradition compels me to speak out for the powerless. The elected majority in Kansas is targeting a population of the least powerful Kansans with House Bill 2071. Medical decisions for children should be made only by their parents and guardians in collaboration with their medical professionals, and certainly not by State Representatives and Senators. The short title of this bill, “enacting help not harm...”, is a lie. Even the proposal of such legislation does terrible emotional damage to these children, causing some to consider taking their own lives. As an ordained minister who pastors trans adults, trans kids and kids who, as they mature, may understand themselves as trans, I implore you to cease this attack and vote against HB 2071.

As with all respectable health care, gender-affirming care is individualized to meet the needs of each patient, managed through a careful and evidence-based model of assessment and informed consent which is already required by law. HB 2071 is an extremist measure that discriminates against and impinges on the free speech rights of all people who are caring for kids, all kids. Many Kansans accept the reality of gender as a non-binary aspect of personhood and we will not stand by for political leaders to try to legislate otherwise. The State of Kansas has crucially important political issues that should be given attention instead of this proposed discriminatory legislation. Please vote against HB 2071.

Sincerely,

Melissa Atchison

731 Houston St., Manhattan, KS 66502

Melissa Gener, MD  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
mgener1@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairperson and members of the committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63/HB2071. My name is Dr. Melissa Gener and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am providing my testimony as a private citizen and not as a representative of any organization. I am writing today to strongly encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63/HB2071.

As a physician, I am incredibly concerned when any bill is introduced that inserts governmental control over the decision-making partnership between physician and patient. They undermined our years of training as well as our relationships and trust of our patients. These bills, in particular, attempt to deny access to care that we know has benefits for the small population in our state that use these treatments.

As a private citizen and taxpayer, I have concerns on the focus on legislature that affects such a small portion of our population. There is no benefit to the Kansas population at large to restrict proven and necessary medical care to a specific targeted population. It is not fiscally responsible to devote a significant portion of the active legislative succession to such a targeted bill when that time could be better spent legislating  
Important healthcare measures such as the expansion of Medicaid. Medicaid expansion is widely supported across party lines by Kansas voters and would affect a large portion of our tax paying state population.

Once again, thank you for listening to my thoughts on this bill and I encourage all of you to vote no on SB 63/HB2071. Thank you.

# LOUD LIGHT CIVIC ACTION

Melissa Stiehler  
Loud Light Civic Action  
Written Opponent Testimony of HB 2071  
For the House Health and Human Services Committee

January 28, 2025

Chair Carpenter and members of the Committee,

Thank you so much for the opportunity to provide testimony today. My name is Melissa Stiehler, and I serve as Advocacy Director of Loud Light Civic Action, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that supports and builds the civic engagement and leadership of young people in Kansas. We represent over 12,000 Kansans, including supporters in every House and Senate district across the state. Loud Light Civic Action unapologetically supports the LGBTQ+ community, including their right to live a happy, healthy life that is free from government interference in their medical care or ability to be themselves in public life. It is with these values that Loud Light Civic Action strongly opposes HB 2071.

## **Concern: This Bill is Extreme, Expands Far Beyond a Ban on Surgical Procedures for Minors**

The legislature is being told that this bill is to prevent permanent medical procedures, such as gender affirming surgeries, on minors. This is an extreme misrepresentation of the full impact of this bill. Its focus on surgical procedures is disingenuous, since this bill covers nearly all aspects of medical care and public life of a transgender minor. HB 2071 defines social transitioning as “acts other than medical or surgical interventions that are undertaken for the purpose of presenting as a member of the opposite sex, including the changing of an individual's preferred pronouns or manner of dress.” By banning state employees and properties from the undefined “promoting” of how a child acts and expresses themselves in those spaces, with those adults, regardless of the parents or guardians wishes - this bill may have the practical impact of attempting to legislate these children out of existence of public life. If it is the true legislative intent to pass a bill to prevent permanent medical intervention - then this bill is not the one to accomplish that. If this legislation were to be signed into law, the harmful consequences would reach far beyond a doctor's office.

## **Concern: Overly Broad, Undefined, and is Certain to have a Chilling Effect on Free Speech**

The broad definition and restrictions of “social transitioning” in this bill are especially troubling, as the terms “promote” and “advocate” are not defined, nor is the scope of who exactly is impacted clear. By including vague language that may impact mental health care workers, social workers, teachers, librarians, employees who work within our foster care system, and so many more whose job it is to care for our children, passing this law would most certainly have a chilling effect on the free speech of our state employees. This chilling effect would lead to diminished care for the most vulnerable children among us, as it is incredibly likely that the staff tasked with supporting them would be too hesitant to provide them the actual care and help they need due to fear of their behavior being labeled as “promoting social transitioning”. While this bill is being presented as narrowly tailored to address a clear and specific concern, that is inaccurate at best. No one can clearly state where the line is on what is and is not considered to be an act of “social transitioning,” nor do they define where the line is of “promoting” this behavior. Where exactly is the line for changing a manner of dress until it is too far away from the sex stereotyping compliance that is it is no longer legal? Is it considered promoting



social transitioning if a staff member allows self expression that may be deemed too outside of their sex stereotypical behavior? Furthermore, what are the enforcement mechanisms for the ban on state employees, agencies, and properties engaging in what this bill would deem unlawful? Who is eligible to decide what is and is not appropriate sex stereotypical behavior and expression under this law? What happens to the employee if they are deemed in violation of this law? When there is no written enforcement mechanism, it introduces the possibility of any and every enforcement mechanism. These are important questions that are not addressed in any manner in this legislation. It is the legislature's responsibility to vet laws for these kinds of errors. It would be reckless to pass legislation that very well may end up in a costly and lengthy court battle just to answer questions that our lawmakers failed to address in the legislative process.

**Concern: Ignores Parental Rights**

HB 2071 effectively bans all gender affirming medical care, regardless of scientific evidence, regardless of individual circumstance, and regardless of the will of the child's parents. Additionally, the inclusion of language that's practical effect, even if not legislative intent, may amount to a state gag order on recognizing or acknowledging transgender children also ignores the will of the parent in how they want their child to be addressed and cared for. Many members of the legislature and of this very committee have concerned themselves deeply with parental rights. This bill would strip loving, informed parents of their right to make the best choices about the medical care and social experience for their child.

**Concern: Places Government Barriers to the Fundamental Right of Bodily Autonomy**

While the constitutionally guaranteed right of bodily autonomy has been something many members of the legislature have openly disparaged, it is still the law of the land and the right of our people. HB 2071 is yet another attempt to disregard personal autonomy in favor of government overreach into our private medical decisions. These medical procedures are banned only for transgender children, while cisgender children are able to and currently receive access to the exact same care without this government interference. Puberty blockers, hormone replacement therapy, and gender affirming surgical care are far more commonly prescribed to cisgender minors than they are to transgender minors, yet that is not for debate in this bill. If the true concern is the medical impact of these procedures on children, then why is the legislature not concerned with the medical impact for *all* children?

**Concern: Government Restrictions on Kansans' Freedom of Self Determination**

One of the most fundamental values of a free society is its people being able to shape their own life without interference or discrimination from their government. HB 2071 is a classic example of a violation of Kansans' Right to Self-Determination. Efforts like HB 2071 are blunt attempts to "legislate away" transgender Kansans by creating government bans to medically necessary, life-saving healthcare access. Again I must repeat, HB 2071 goes far beyond medical care and mandates how adults respond to children's acts and self expression. Children are reliant on the adults in their life tasked with caring for them, and by adding government regulation that restricts these adults from "promoting" the child's free expression of themselves, it may have the practical impact of government mandated restrictions on the child and their own self expression. Simply put, it is not the government's business to mandate these things. Interference like this will make for a less free society for all Kansans.

**For these reasons, Loud Light Civic Action strongly urges members of this committee to oppose HB 2071**, and urges the legislature to please, leave transgender children and their families alone. It is not in the best interest for the state to place themselves in the middle of decisions best left to a patient, their parents, and their doctor. Thank you all for your time and I hope you take my testimony into consideration.

HB 2071 - WRITTEN ONLY

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to HB 2071. As a public school educator, I anticipate that this legislation will cause unnecessary harm for transgender students. This bill is an overreach, attempting to limit or take away the rights of transgender youth and their families to make medical, therapeutic, and social decisions for themselves. It would create conflict between doctors and their patients, therapists and their clients, and teachers and their students by not allowing these professionals to use their best judgment and care for transgender youth.

As a teacher, I am particularly concerned that laws prohibiting professionals from recognizing a person's "social transitioning" would damage the student's trust of teachers, doctors, and therapists, causing harm to transgender students. It is not a threat to public health for doctors, teachers, and therapist to honor a transgender youth's name and pronouns, but it very likely would cause harm to the transgender youth if this bill is passed.

My objective as an educator is to create an environment where all of my students are accepted and to eliminate barriers to learning. This bill would do the opposite.

Thank you for your time.

Mendy Hutson

To Whom It May Concern:

My question to you regarding HB 2071 is this: Why are we here again? Why are we here at all? Every single professional organization has stated *very* clearly: Denying transgender children care is detrimental to their health and well-being. This is not a “phase” – this is who they are regardless of your understanding. Do you think they would choose to have so many politicians target them and treat them in such an inhumane manner? No, like so many other medical conditions, this is a congenital condition. The difference is that it makes them a political target.

These children have a depression and anxiety rate that soars above their peers. Over 50% of transgender children are diagnosed with mental health issues compared to 20% of their peers. These bills intensify their pain. They know you are hunting them. It is for sport and not their well-being. If it was their well-being, you would listen to the professional organizations. You would not have removed supporters from your chambers last year. You would not need to misrepresent facts. Did you know that over 30% of these children are suicidal? Did you know that the suicide rate in Auschwitz was 25%. What does that tell you about the severity.

These bills cost lives. If left to medical professionals, their care is actually prescribed by an international protocol with proven success and safety. These protocols begin with therapy and remains there unless or until there is a need to move forward. Some never move from that place. Some need further intervention for their well-being and often the alternative is worsening mental health. The medications have been proven safe and are reversible. To deny that means that those that take them for other purposes are in danger. Are you prepared to say that? No, you are not. You like to carry on about surgery but doing that before the age of 18 is excessively rare. You project an incorrect message that every child jumps into surgery. That is tacitly incorrect and you know it. Overall, though? If you care about the facts? Less than 10% have the surgery you are in hysterics about – *at any age*. Let’s be honest. You care only about the male genitalia. That is rare. But the regret rate is less than 1%. But that is about adults. *Again, this is excessively rare in children*. But in the real world, more than 30% are suicidal. Studies have shown that this increases when the state starts persecuting them.

The damage you are causing children is immense. It isn’t a matter of “they can’t have it and therefore are fine or ‘protected’.” No, this is a very real fact that denying them care is detrimental. It will have a death rate. Not an “if.” It will. It is already harming them. You are already harming them.

My question to you is: Why are you so intensely focused on less than 1% of children. You are taking excessive amounts of time and therefore taxpayer money persecuting these children that are less than 1% of the population but so much at risk. You are intentionally making their lives miserable. You are making their lives *worse*. Why aren’t you focused, say, on helping the over 20% of children in this state that are food insecure? If you are honest, you will admit that these laws come out of thinktanks that mobilized after marriage equality became the law of the land. They needed to attack another part of the LGBTQIA community and you went for the absolute defenseless. They are your perfect victim and target for your political gain. They deserve equal protection, not persecution and removal of their rights to appropriate healthcare. *Again, every professional organization supports gender affirming care.*

Another question: Why aren’t the facts recognized in this decision? They are truly clear with no grey area except what you are manufacturing as you push through dangerous misinformation. The question

remains – why are you targeting these children and why are you so fixated that you are blocking the truth? If you genuinely cared about their welfare, facts would matter.

Another question: Why are you placing these workers in a place where they can see these children suffering. Every day they are there keeping these kids connected and safe. Unlike you, they know these kids. They know the truth you want to conceal. They want to listen and care and do the right thing for them. So, is the government going to dictate what they can think and say to a child? Are you prepared to dictate a reality that you not only do not understand but refuse to properly witness? You are going to control their speech and expression. You are seeking to violate their First Amendment rights.

You are targeting children that have no choice in who they are and how they were created. You would not deny medical care for any other medical condition in this manner. You would not deny any other group the right to talk about their condition and their actual identity. You would not deny workers the right to talk to them and care for them in the manner suited to the situation. You would not attempt to deny that the condition was real and punish those who have it. You would not sentence them to an endangered state. You would not insert your opinion over the established consensus of the medical community.

You are cutting them off from those who interact with them for a large portion of their lives. They cannot reach out for understanding and support. Instead, how many will sink deeper and potentially die. These deaths are preventable since you are involved in the cause.

Transgender kids do not have any choice in this. They had no choice in having their condition. They have no voice in what you are doing to them. None. However, *you do have the choice to **do the right thing***. You can choose to allow citizens of this state to retain the right to work with medical professionals in their medical care (governed by international protocols). You can choose to let them have professionals to go to when they are upset, scared, depressed, or just need someone to talk to. You can choose to *not* violate the First Amendment rights of those entrusted with their care.

You no doubt have rallied as “pro-life,” so be pro-life and respect the lives of these children. Respect that they are struggling and one-third are at risk of taking their lives. If you want to say you are pro-life, then care about these lives. Protect these lives by leaving the medical decisions where they belong. Protect these lives by rejecting this bill and the harm it represents. Focus on running this state and managing the real problems.

Make a good impact and stop persecuting children.

Make a good impact and do not violate the First Amendment rights of those who work with these children.

*Do what is right. Respect the actual facts. Stop victimizing children for political gain.*

Please do what is right. You have the choice.

Michele A. Montour  
Lawrence, KS

Michelle Knoll  
Private citizen  
Butterflybaisers87@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and members of the committee,

Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on SB 63/ HB 2071 with you today. My name is Michelle Knoll and I am a voter in Wyandotte county and a physician. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63/HB 2071.

While discussing the contents of this bill, I encourage all congresspeople to remember that the children and adolescents that could be impacted by this bill are listening. They are individuals and do not deserve to be treated as less than anyone else.

Regarding the content of the bill itself: this bill is a massive overreach beyond even the stated goals of "help not harm" of children.

Firstly, it prevents state employees from promoting the use of social transition in children. Exploration of identity and expression is one of the most important developmental aspects of children and adolescents. It causes no harm and is completely reversible. Furthermore, this is encouraged in non transgender children. We use nicknames all the time in children and adolescents—Robert becomes Bobby, Elizabeth becomes Lizzy. There is no harm in someone choosing a different name to go by. Hair also grows out and clothing styles change. These all should be encouraged and explored regardless of one's gender identity.

Secondly, the extremely punitive measures against physicians will limit care to all children. Kansas will have a greater difficulty recruiting physicians who provide other health care and will encourage physicians to move to states where there are no restrictions on our ability to care for patients. Moreover, professionals who have gender diverse children, potentially including physicians, nurses, teachers, mental health providers, etc, will either leave or not want to come to Kansas, impacting Kansas' overall economy. Given the general shortage of physicians everywhere and the already present challenge of recruiting to the Midwest, this will only exacerbate the problem and will impact care outside of gender affirming care (including mental health access, diabetes care, and primary care).

Finally, I encourage the members of the committee to actually understand what it means to provide gender affirming care. It does not mean immediately putting kids on hormones as soon as they declare a variant gender identity. It does not mean doing surgery on minors. It does not mean giving testosterone to prepubertal girls or estrogen to prepubertal boys. It does mean

encouraging family support of the child and support of a mental health team to address concerns about depression, anxiety, and other mental health symptoms. It does mean talking extensively with the adolescent about what bothers them about their body and what realistically can be changed. It does mean encouraging the adolescent to explore what it means to be a man or a woman and try out different hairstyles, names, and styles of clothing. It does mean discussing at length long term repercussions of altering hormones. Often it doesn't mean medical or surgical interventions at all, but rather simply providing the care we would provide non transgender peers. And sometimes it does mean hormone therapy, after all the discussions with the therapist, adolescent, and parents. And those who do get there overwhelmingly have improvement in their confidence and mental health and most often become thriving members of society.

Once again, thank you for your time and consideration. I strongly encourage you to vote no on SB63 / HB 2071 for the health and well being of all Kansans.

Mindy Nickles  
Educator  
Written Only Testimony – Opponent  
House Health and Human Services  
House Bill 2071  
January 28, 2025

Chairperson Landwehr, members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to HB 2071. As a 5th grade teacher in Kansas, I work with students who are approaching some of their hardest years of their childhood. My students are getting ready to leave the safety and security of an elementary classroom to middle school, a difficult time few of us wish to revisit. Daily, my students learn concepts such as long division and analyzing poetry, all while navigating puberty and figuring out the person they are becoming.

As a student, I was lucky to have the freedom to explore my identity without government officials telling my teachers and doctors how they help me. The wonderful mentors around me checked in during tough times, taught me how to manage my emotions, and made school a welcoming, safe place. My teachers then know what I know now - educating is more than just teaching the textbooks. Inherently, individuals have to feel safe to be able to concentrate and learn. That is why I'm extremely concerned about HB 2071.

I oppose HB 2071 because it will directly interfere with the ability to do my job, which is to educate ALL children. My students are at an age where they begin questioning both themselves and the world around them. I've been privileged to have students come to me to share their struggles, and HB 2071 will interfere with my ability to continue this. When students are unable to talk about their identity and be affirmed, my classroom no longer becomes a safe place to learn, but another obstacle students have to navigate daily; another place transgender or trans-questioning children are told they do not belong. To be clear, our schools and youth will be negatively impacted by this bill.

Kansas' motto, *Ad astra per aspera*—to the stars through difficulties—aptly describes teaching. Let's not add more difficulties for our teachers, staff, and trans students.

Mo Maddox  
Private Citizen  
coxemj@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee- thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Mo Maddox and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I am a lifelong Kansan who was born and raised in North Central Kansas. Both of my parents are high school educators, and as a minor in a rural town of less than 1,000 people, I was an active member of community organizations. Growing up I knew I was a member of the queer community, but did not know in what capacity.

While I was an "A" student who stayed out of trouble, won awards, and was already admitted to an in-state University, I thought investing in personal relationships was a lost cause. I lived a very lonely life, and I felt as if it had never truly "began". I was doing my best to fit the mold of the perfect daughter, pupil, and neighbor, but did not feel like a whole, complete, individual. I did not see a path forward for myself that would foster any joy and fulfillment. In high school, I suffered from passive suicidality, frequently wondering if my life would be better if I just didn't wake up in the morning.

As I left for college, I had the opportunity to meet other people like me. Classmates who had changed their names, neighbors who had changed their pronouns, and friends who had worked with their physicians to find medications that would help their bodies feel more like home- similar to how weight loss medications, reconstructive plastic surgery, and rhinoplasty makes others feel more confident and excited to participate in their families, workplaces, and communities.

When I came out as trans in my 20's, I thought it was too late for me to start testosterone. I didn't have the opportunity to get any taller, it would take years for my facial hair to grow in fully, and I would be experiencing a pseudo-puberty as a 25 year old. But, starting my medical transition with a healthcare provider specializing in gender affirming care was the first choice in life I made entirely for myself. And I do not regret it one bit.

Now, when I look in the mirror every morning, I see a person, not just a pair of exhausted eyes looking back at me. Within a few weeks of my first injection, my anxiety and depression reduced significantly. I felt at home in my body. I wanted to move- go for a run, play sports, go out to social events. I no longer felt self conscious in front of a room of people. My voice deepened and I rediscovered my love of singing, I learned how to laugh loudly again, I happily made phone calls to loved ones that I had been avoiding.



Now, I trust myself to make decisions. I married a wonderful man. I hold a leadership position in my workplace. I've put down roots in my community and seek out ways to support my neighbors.

And now, as a much happier and confident man, I wonder how much further I would be in life if I was able to experience this change alongside my peers. Or if my parents, who always strove to do what society asked of them, felt comfortable encouraging me to explore my identity as a teenager. Even if I was not able to transition medically, what if I knew that this future was waiting for me around the corner once I had reached the age of majority?

And now I ask you to reflect on yourselves. What would your life be like if you reached puberty at the age of 18? Would you show up in your workplaces the same way? Would you have felt confident going out in public and making friends? Would you have been a persuasive public speaker? Now imagine if you reached puberty at 25, like I did.

I know I am one of the lucky ones. We represent 1% of the population. Yet there is legislation being proposed that seeks to standardize and restrict the trans experience, instead of allowing us the freedom to dream and plan our lives for a happier future.

Thank you for listening to my story. I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Mona R. Hargrave  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
mrhargrave226@gmail.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Example: "Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Mona Hargrave and I am a voter in Saline County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

I'm opposed to government taking away any human being's bodily autonomy in making any kind of healthcare decisions. Healthcare decisions should be left between families and their physicians/healthcare team.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you."

Monica Brown  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
monicalb7199@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and members of the committee: I appreciate the opportunity to be able to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you. Being heard is a cornerstone of our democratic system and one I do not take for granted. My name is Monica Brown, and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing to encourage a NO vote on SB 63 / HB 2071

The discussion about transgender rights has become heated and emotional. I understand opinions differ and that we live in a time of change and challenging our thinking of what we have always considered to be "normal." This is where I would like to focus my thoughts. Ours is not to understand the need for transgender people to seek the care and treatment they must have in order to feel stable, worthwhile, and mentally healthy, just as it is not for others to understand why we might want to fix crooked teeth with braces, remove an unsightly benign mole, or reduce an oversized nose with rhinoplasty.

The Trevor Project has conducted a peer-reviewed study that has come to alarming conclusions:

The study's findings demonstrated a significant increase in suicide attempts among all participants whose home state had enacted at least one anti-transgender law. The highest increase in suicide attempt rates – ranging from 7% to 72% — was reported among participants younger than age 18. Across the full sample of transgender and nonbinary young people ages 13-24, an increase in suicide attempt rates of 38% to 44% was observed.

These people are vulnerable. Your constituents, their family members, their friends are vulnerable. These human beings are vulnerable. And their need to feel human and at peace with themselves is not harming their neighbor, despite what some might want to spread in the way of fear and hatred. Their existence is not increasing sexual assaults in public restrooms. Their decisions to be themselves affect them. Their right to exist does not restrict anyone else's right to do the very same.

When we choose legislation, it should be for the betterment of the community. This bill will do more harm than good. It has the potential to have a direct correlation to a rise in suicide attempts in a community that is simply trying to live their lives. To not pass it would not change the lives of those proposing the bill one bit. The risks outweigh the benefits far too much, and for that reason, I ask you not to support it.

Please choose life. Please choose MY CHILD'S life.

Again, I appreciate your taking the time to consider my thoughts on this important bill. I again ask you to please vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Monroe Hanson  
Private citizen  
monroe.hanson13@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chair & committee members, thank you for your time. I am a voter in Douglas County and have been a Kansas resident for 12 years. I am writing today to urge the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I opposed this bill last year, and I've opposed all of the similar bills from the last several years. Medical decisions should be between an individual and their doctor, or in this case between an individual, their parent/guardian, and their doctor. The state has no business interfering in private medical decisions.

This bill failed last year because of its extremely broad reach beyond the healthcare space, such as restricting the freedom of speech of public employees. This bill seeks to force an ideology and compel speech from healthcare providers, social workers, school counselors, therapists, teachers, and more. This would be a major first amendment rights violation that would face instantaneous court challenges for its unconstitutionality.

The Kansas legislature has better things to be doing than ruining the lives of trans kids and restricting free speech and expression of public employees. Kansans don't want this. Kansans have never wanted this. This will continue to be an unpopular culture war topic meant to divide us. I urge the committee to focus on the actual needs of Kansans - including trans Kansans and their families.

Thank you again for your time. I encourage each member of the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

Nancy Sims-West  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
nsimswest@yahoo.com  
1/28/0025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Nancy Sims-West and I am a voter in Douglas County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071"

I am retired after 41 years of teaching in secondary schools. I care deeply about the wellbeing of our youth, and passage of this bill would severely reduce their wellbeing. We know that trans youth are far more likely to commit suicide when denied gender-affirming care. All adolescents and teens struggle with identity and belonging, and this can be especially difficult for trans kids. They need support and care, not Draconian measures to try to make them conform to someone else's idea of who they should be. I have worked with countless students, and each has been unique and worthy of care and support, no matter the color of their skin, their family's income level, their place of origin, their sexuality, or their gender. I never allowed actions of hatred or bigotry in my classroom and I will not remain silent about this bill filled with hatred and bigotry, not to mention its ignoring of science and research. Too many of my students suffered because people around them did not give them the support they needed. Some harmed themselves. Some "merely" lived in emotional pain. No child - no person - deserves that. I implore you to vote no on this exceedingly harmful bill and to instead promote the care and wellbeing of all our youth, including transgender ones.

Thank you, and again please vote no on the passage of SB / HB 2071.

Written testimony in Opposition to HB 2071  
House Committee on Health and Human Services  
January 28, 2025

Please Do Not Vote for HB 2071!

Whoever composed it for consideration as a good, beneficial public health and welfare policy has unfortunately, and perhaps unintentionally, served Kansans instead with a distorted health concept based on fear and misunderstanding of the medical and human processes involved. It does not realistically see the misinformation and the cruel long term effects both acute and chronic on human beings on both sides of the care, both receiving and giving. It does not value them both. It does not respect life. Do not vote for HB 2071.

I have close friends fleeing from their beloved Kansas because of life threat to family member due to such unnecessary, uninformed, inhumane extremes as are proposed in HB 2071.

Thank you.

Nancy Stover  
for  
SUFEA ( Save Us From Extreme Actions)

An Organization formed in Manhattan Kansas

420 Colorado  
Apt.3G  
Manhattan, Ks. 66502

Natalie Dorsey  
Private Citizen  
nattreff@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Natalie Dorsey and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to express my opposition to SB 63 / HB 2071 and to encourage the committee to vote no on these bills.

I firmly believe that decisions about medical care should remain between patients, their families, and qualified healthcare providers—not the government. Gender-affirming care is recognized by every major medical association, including the American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Medical Association, as essential and often lifesaving for transgender youth.

Banning this care risks harming the mental health and well-being of some of our most vulnerable youth. Studies consistently show that access to gender-affirming care reduces rates of depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation in transgender individuals. Removing access to this care could exacerbate these challenges and increase rates of harm.

Additionally, this legislation infringes on parental rights and their ability to make the best decisions for their children's health. Families deserve the freedom to work with healthcare providers to pursue evidence-based treatments tailored to their unique needs.

Furthermore, doctors and mental health providers should not face legal threats, fines, or even the loss of their licenses for providing medically necessary, compassionate care. These professionals follow rigorous standards of care, making individualized decisions with the input of families and patients.

Transgender youth are among the most vulnerable in our society. Many face overwhelming challenges, including bullying, rejection, and the daily fear of being misunderstood or unsafe. Gender-affirming care, provided with the guidance of medical professionals, can be a lifeline for these young people. It is not about politics—it is about giving families and healthcare providers the tools they need to support children in becoming healthy, happy adults. As leaders, you have the power to ensure that our state protects and uplifts all children, regardless of their gender identity.

The language of the bill clearly discriminates against transgender Kansans and raises constitutional concerns about state employee's free speech rights. I believe we have a shared responsibility to protect our most vulnerable community members, our children, and to ensure



that all young people have the chance to thrive. Therefore, I urge you to vote against SB 63 / HB 2071 and instead focus on policies that promote the well-being of all children in our state.

I thank you for hearing my thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no on the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Neva Rowland  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
neva.rowland.87@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63 / HB 2071 with you today. My name is Neva Rowland and I am a voter on Crawford County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I oppose this bill and think legislators should vote against it because every person has the fundamental right to access the health care they need without fear of discrimination, prejudice, or barriers to treatment that supports their mental, physical, and emotional well-being.

When legislators attempt to regulate who can access gender-affirming care, they are inserting political beliefs into private and personal conversations between parents and their children, and patients and their doctors. These laws are not about safety — as the safety and efficacy of gender-affirming care for transgender and non-binary youth and adults is clear. Instead, in ignoring a wealth of scientific evidence and overwhelming support from the medical community, you are attempting to enshrine discrimination into law. Rather than protecting kids, these laws are preventing parents and young people from making informed medical decisions, and doctors and health care providers from providing best-practice care to their patients.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071. Thank you.

Hello, my name is Nico Garner, and I am submitting this written testimony in opposition to SB 63. By the bare minimum, this bill would be impeding Kansan's First Amendment rights by restricting freedom of speech and individual expression for transgender youth, state employees, parents of trans youth, and more. This would create obstacles to necessary education, as well as obstruct medical practices for both doctors and their patients. America is already dealing with a mental health crisis, and in 2024 LGBTQ+ youth who reported living in very accepting communities attempted suicide at less than half the rate of those who reported living in very unaccepting communities. The first nationally representative survey of LGBTQ+ youth has found that 3.3% of U.S. highschoolers identify as transgender and 2.2% as questioning. In 2023, "72% of transgender students and 69% of those questioning report persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness and 1 in 4 attempted suicide." ([www.the74million.org](http://www.the74million.org)). Ten percent of trans youth received medical treatment after trying to take their own life. In September of 2023, the Trevor Project found the rate of suicide attempts rose by up to 72% in places that rolled back protections of trans youth between 2018 and 2022.

By banning trans healthcare for minors, you are not protecting your most vulnerable constituents. Instead of our youth being able to talk to professionals about what they are feeling, and being taken seriously for who they are, they will be a part of a hostile culture that convinces kids that they aren't worth being advocated for, even in medical and youth-based settings. Please do not revert Kansas back to outdated ideals and a dangerous environment for an entire demographic of people who are constantly attacked by the entire U.S. already. Let's keep Kansas as a safe and considerate place, and let that be our legacy. Thank you.

Nicole Kamradt  
Kansas Educator  
Written Testimony – Opponent  
House Committee on Health and Human Services  
Senate Bill 63  
January 28, 2025

Chairperson Carpenter and members of the Committee:

Thank you for taking the time to read this testimony in regards to HB 2071 that would prohibit gender affirming care for minors. I am in strong opposition to this bill because as a Kansas educator for eight years I do not believe it is what's best for our children. I spent six years working as an art teacher with elementary age students before I moved to the high school level last year. My experience has provided me with the opportunity to work with a wide age range of kids, from all walks of life. What I know, without a doubt, is that students learn best when they feel safe and accepted.

This bill would make it incredibly difficult to do my job if students are afraid to be their most authentic selves. If a child is not permitted to be themselves we see it most clearly in a decline of their mental health. It is crucial for children of all stages of development to have adults that they trust and a strong social community that they know cares for them in order to grow into their best selves. This bill would show them that we do not support them.

I recall one particular elementary student whose family had moved school districts so she could attend school with her new name and identity to make the transition easier. It saddens me that it was necessary for them to go to this extent so their child could be accepted for who they were. Ultimately with her supportive family and access to necessary healthcare she was able to attend school safely and has grown into an amazing individual.

I can imagine that the decision this family made was not taken lightly and that the parents had many conversations with their child about what they wanted. The option to seek help from medical professionals and do what is best for their child should be a right that all parents have access to. It would be extremely detrimental to our Kansas community if families were not permitted access to necessary healthcare for their children.

A complex decision about one's identity should be a conversation between a person's family and medical professional. I compel you to think about what is truly best for children and put your trust in Kansas communities when voting on this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to SB 63.

Nicole Kamradt

Nina Fricke  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
ninafricke9@gmail.com  
1/26/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Chairman and Members of the Committee, Thank you for giving me time to share my thoughts on SB 63/HB 2071 with you. My name is Nina Fricke and I am a voter in Johnson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on SB 63/HB 2071.

Patients, families and their doctors should have the freedom to make their own complicated medical decisions can be and how important it is to have privacy to confer with medical professionals without outside interference. You would wish to have that freedom and privacy for decisions for your family. All families deserve that freedom. All major medical associations advocate against bills like this. Gender affirming care is carefully managed for each individual using evidence-based guidelines.

The language in this bill is also too broad and could negatively affect a wide variety of non-medical people such as teachers, counselors, and day care providers who interact with children. The language in the bill clearly discriminates against Transgender Kansans.

I thank you for hearing my thoughts and perspective. I encourage all of you to vote NO on SB 63/HB 2071. Thank you.

Nyx Ionic  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
Shogun.endo@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Committee, chairman, thank you for hearing your voters' testimony on SB 63 / HB 2071. My name is Nyx Ionic and I'm a voter from Wyandotte county. I write you today to firmly encourage you to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

Simply put, the bills under consideration should be rejected on numerous grounds: they are a waste of time that inflicts pointless cruelty, and consumers state resources to do so. I know I was trans from a very young age, but didn't have the language or concepts to understand and communicate what I felt. Accordingly, I suffered for decades, wracked by depression and a feeling of pointlessness in life. A number of my dreams were snuffed out thus, and while I made it through college, I barely did so. I began my career as an engineer, but it was only after I finally began my transition that I truly became able to LIVE. Life matters now, and no longer is everything shrouded in a grey haze. On a purely practical level, my work output and productivity has literally quadrupled, making me not only more able to provide for my family, but also vastly more economically productive. God knows, had I really had the chance to transition as a child, to experience puberty correctly the first time around? I would be even better off! Not only would I be happier and less burdened, but far better able to contribute. Indeed, if I transitioned earlier, I probably could have paid another fifty thousand dollars in taxes by now. I include mention of my economic contributions here in case any of you may be swayed by it. But ALL of you should also reject SB 63 / HB 2071 even solely on the grounds of protecting young Kansans from unbearable cruelty and increased suicide risk. If you want a more powerful and productive Kansas, vote NO. If you want kids to live instead of killing themselves, vote NO.

Thank you once again for hearing my thoughts and personal truth regarding SB 63 / HB 2071. If your hearts feel and beat at all, vote NO on the bills under consideration. Thank you.

OLIVIA COLE  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
mommastreefrog@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

To the Senators and Representatives of Kansas; to the voices that are to speak for me and the 2.941 million other Kansans who have no other voice but yours.

My name is Olivia Cole and I am in opposition to SB63 and HB2071.

I was born and raised in Kansas. I grew up learning about the great USA, helping free Americans and many other oppressed peoples from tyranny.

We are a place where Caucasian people, African people, Hispanic people, Indigenous people, Asian people, males and females, males to females, females to males, tomboys, femboys, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Satanists, the young, the elderly, any person with a heartbeat is safe in America to exercise their constitutional rights, and most importantly, freedom. We were a place of this.

Today many Americans, including myself, fear we are headed into tyranny; especially the most recently attacked community, the people with a heartbeat who are gender nonconforming. My boyfriend has been a trans female to male for five years, long enough to be considered trans by a professional therapist. He has attempted suicide four times. The first time he tried was at eleven years old. This was largely because his parents were very unsupportive when he came out. They refused to use his correct pronouns. They refused to let him modify his name. They refused to immediately get him a therapist. They refused to see him for who he is. He lacked the major support he needed. He felt like an outcast, a non-normal individual, at eleven years old. It drove him to his first attempt of suicide.

At eleven years old.

He has told me on many occasions, as he has told his therapist, I am the main reason he is alive today. That's not because I ever found him during an attempt and was able to stop him by impeccable timing. It's because he knew I cared. He knew I would hurt. He knew I love him. It was not impeccable timing that saved his life. It was support that saved his life.

In the standard population between 2013 and 2017, 40 people out of 100,000 people committed suicide. 43 trans women out of 100,000 people committed suicide. 34 trans men out of 100,000 people committed suicide. The trans community lost almost twice as many people compared to

the standard population. "Trends in Suicide Death Risk in Transgender People: Results from the Amsterdam Cohort of Gender Dysphoria Study (1972-2017)"

Imagine an eleven year old child who is not allowed to get a haircut to feel comfortable in their own skin.

Imagine an eleven year old child who cannot be educated about the trans community, feeling outcast and alone because they have no words for their feelings.

Imagine an eleven year old child who commits suicide because not only did they lack support in their own home, but in therapy and school as well.

Imagine what the trans suicide statistic would rise to in a world like that.

A world of tyranny.

I am doing my part by speaking out against SB63 and HB2071. I am begging you to do your part by saying no to the same bills we've already refused in the past.

Thank you,

A hopeful Kansan.



Olivia Crouch  
PRIVATE CITIZEN  
nyancrouch5@gmail.com  
1/28/2025

For both SB 63 and HB 2071  
Opponent  
Written only

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee, Thanks for giving me time to share my perspective on SB 63 / HB 2071 with yall today. My name is Olivia Crouch, I am a voter in Shawnee. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on SB 63 / HB 2071.

I stand in opposition to SB 63 / HB 2071 because I am a Trans Woman who benefited from gender affirming hormone blockers and professionally assisted hormone replacement therapy as a minor. I came out as transgender when I was 15 years old and getting access to gender affirming care as a minor saved my life. I was deeply depressed and facing a reality where I could never live as my true self. But thankfully due to reaching out to my family, medical professionals, and mental health professionals I was able to get the assistance I needed to transition and alleviate my crippling gender dysphoria. I fear what would have happened to me had I not had access to gender affirming care when I did and I fear for trans youth today who if this were passed would have to face that reality...

Anyways I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill and I encourage you all to vote no to the passage of SB 63 / HB 2071 Thank You!